DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 266 UD 014 803

AUTHOR Thelen, Herbert A.; And Others
TITLE The Educational Ethos of the Midwestern High School.
INSTITUTION Chicago Univ., Ill. Dept. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 290p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$14.59 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Classroom Observation Techniques; *Classroom Research; Cultural Factors; *High Schools; Organizational Climate; School Attitudes; School Organization; *School Orientation; *School Planning; *Social Differences; Student Attitudes; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The object of the investigations reported here is the perceptions students and teachers have of "actual" classrooms and of their "ideal" classrooms. The data come from 10 junior--level classrooms in each of five high schools. The 10 classrooms were selected as follows: two each in English, mathematics, and social Studies; with the remaining four sampling the range of other courses. The five schools were selected as follows: one middle-class highly academic college preparatory school, one lower class black trade school; one lower class black "general" school; one traditional agricultural-community school; and one innovative "democratic" school oriented to personal interests of students. The data are the responses of students and teachers on the recently developed Authenticity Legitimacy Productivity (ALP)-ETHOS instrument; demographic data on each student; interviews with principals; and teachers' estimates of time devoted in class to various activities. The investigation was confined to two questions. Who succeeds in school? What demographic characteristics distinguish high achievers from lower achievers? The broader question was who benefits from school and, usually unexamined, what are these benefits? The second question was: For whom is the school designed? That is, for whom does it provide educational opportunities and for whom does it not? (Author/JM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED102266

THE EDUCATIONAL ETHOS OF THE MIDWESTERN HIGH SCHOOL

HERBERT A THELEN

Assisted By:
SUSAN G ARISMAN
DONALD CICHON
TOM DAVID
GEORGE OLSON
SUSAN WEISS-HANDLER
ANNETTE YONKE

And:
THE SPENCER FOUNDATION
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1974

UD 014 [illegible]

Preface

The investigations reported in this book are intended to define and operationalize a construct of Classroom Ethos or Way of Life; to develop methods of inquiry appropriate to Ethos data; and to describe the Ethos of the Midwestern High School. Further reports, based on the same pool of data, will be concerned with the nature of schools as organizations, the influences of school subjects on classrooms, and the classification of classroom Ethos patterns.

This research developed from the ruminations of a theory seminar in the Fall of 1970. We were tussling with the perennial question of the nature of an "educative" way of life. The central aspects of authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity (ALP) had been presented* but remained elusive. The seminar decided to try to operationalize these notions by constructing some sort of appraisal instrument. The first form of the ALP-Ethos instrument turned out to be highly interpretable and we tried it out on some twenty-five workshops, seminars, and classes, including three each in New Zealand, Australia, and Hungary. For the next two years, a succession of research seminars explored connections between Ethos and a variety of demographic, instructional, and output variables. A number of working papers were produced for in-house consumption, culminating in the manual for interpreting classroom "Vignettes" (ALP Bulletin #9, appended).

In November 1972, the Spencer Foundation kindly agreed to support the Investigations for two years. The research team was assembled from among the graduate students who had helped in the preliminary studies. Annette Yonke, who had been involved from the very first, became office manager and assistant director. The others were Tom David, Susan Weiss-Handler, Susan Arisman, George Olson, and Don Cichon. This team participated in all phases of the investigation, from initial design to final data treatment. The staff also conducted research seminars each quarter and the "apprentices" participated with the staff in whatever had to be done. These adjunct assistants were indispensible during the collection of data from the fifty classrooms in five schools.

---

* Dialogue in Education, University of Chicago Press, scheduled for publication in 1976

The selection of the schools benefited greatly from the suggestions of our colleagues Roger Pillet, Don Erickson, and Henrietta Schwartz. Professor Schwartz, whose relationships with school administrators was as warm as her knowledge of their schools was encyclopedic, arranged our entree. The Principals, professionals all, enabled us to present the project to their teachers, helped us find the ten we needed in each school, suffered the invasion of student researchers, and stood behind the research in every possible way. Although their schools may not be named, the men certainly can: Dr Frank Lucenti, Dr Peter Johnson, Dr George Walters, Dr Dick Stephenson, and Dr David Peterson. In the higher administrative echelon, our old friend, Dr Curtis Melnick, came to the rescue when needed. Among the teachers, Forrest Parkay captained the task force in his school. Our students were deeply impressed with the helpfulness and professionalism of the teachers, some of whom were working under very adverse conditions. The teachers were given work-ups of the ALP data from their classes, and about half of them found time to discuss the conclusions with our staff. Later on, when it came time to get the demographic data from the school records, the office staffs continued the pattern of helpfulness.

With the data in hand, the real inquiries began. We compared various ways of displaying the data in order to identify its potentialities; and we gradually got on speaking terms with the computer. Different members of the team were responsible for explorations in different areas and the whole staff reflected on all of the explorations.

Annette Yonke, besides managing the organization, worked out her PhD thesis on relationships between teachers' emotionalities (reactions to group situations test) and their accuracy in predicting the students' responses on the ALP instrument. Susan Weiss-Handler did much of the preliminary study of the Z-score methodology and she also has nearly fininshed her PhD study of teachers' ego-levels (Loevinger) in relation to their ALP perceptions and values. Susan Arisman designed the Principals' interviews and wrote them up (appendix). She did the first draft of the chapter on achievement, worked out the treatment of socio-economic status, and is currently completing her PhD analysis of sex differences throughout our data. Tom David explored connections between ALP profiles and teacher-supplied data on classroom achievement; and he also developed a number of leads for subsequent study of item performance across the fifty classrooms. George Olson was largely responsible for computing the derived variables--satisfaction, and the various kinds of student-teacher congruence. He also did his MA paper in connection with the project and is currently designing his PhD study on the Ethos of bi-racial classes. Don Cichon wrote several computer programs and worked out the disciminant function analysis for this report and, more extensively, for the anticipated report on the fifty classrooms. He devoted his MA paper to the first explorations of subject-related Ethos patterns.

We invite reactions from readers of this monograph. Comments about methodology, points to emphasize, cognate research, Ethos interpretation, practical implications for improving education, and names of others who might find the work useful--will all be gratefully received, especially while work on the remaining two reports is in progress.

Department of Education
University of Chicago
November 1974

Herbert A. Thelen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

i Preface

x List of Tables

Chapter 1 - The Nature of the Investigations

1 The Variable and the Data
4 Conceptions of Classes: The Questions
10 Preliminary Impressions of the Five Schools
10 The "community" School
10 The "Interest" School
11 The"Trade" School
11 The "General" School
12 The "Academic" School
13 Rationale
14 The Organization of This Report

Chapter 2- Appraisal of Classroom Ethos

16 Way of Life
16 Function
17 Research Design
18 Search for Definition
19 The General Concept
20 Aspect versus Dimension
22 Educational Orientations
24 The ALP Constructs
24 Authenticity
25 Legitimacy
26 Productivity
29 The ALP-Ethos Instrument and Its Use
31 Interpretation.

Chapter 3- Formal Properties of Cultural Elements: Analytical Constructs

34 Characteristicness
35 Congruence
38 Satisfaction
39 Diversity
40 Discriminant Functions
41 Summary: The Questions about Items.

Chapter 4- Treatment of Data and Display of Evidence

43 The Sample
43 The Protocols
43 Numbers of Respondents
43 Characteristicness
44 Congruence
44 Satisfaction
44 Diversity
57 Z-Score Combinations as Indicators of Cultural Elements
59 Discriminant Functions
60 The Interpretations

63 Chapter 5- School Culture: The Way of Life

65 Overview of Categories
68 Category A: Cultural Definition of the Nature of Schools
72 Categories B,C, and D: The Hard Realities
79 Category E: Role Conflict -- Values
81 Category F: Role Conflict-- Concerns
88 Categories G & H: Double Incongruence
90 Grand Summary: The Cultural Pattern of the School
91 The Top Third
93 The Bottom Third
95 The Middle Third
96 The Basic Pattern: A Concise Interpretation

97 Chapter 6- School Culture: Subsystem Similarity and Diversity

99 Between Schools: Actual Classrooms
101 Ideal Classrooms
103 Within Schools: Actual Classromms
105 Ideal Classrooms
108 Summary: Differences and Similarities Between and Within Schools
111 Comparison of Within and Between School Perceptions
113 The Four Kinds of Cultural Elements
114 General Culture
115 Local Norms
116 Permissiveness
117 Institutional Maintenance

119 Chapter 7- School Culture: Discriminant Modes and Issues

120 Discriminant Function #1: Student Actuals
122 #2: Student Actuals
124 #3: Student Actuals
126 Discriminant Function #1: Student Ideals
129 #2: Student Ideals
132 Summary

133 Chapter 8- Educational Opportunity: Satisfaction

- 135 Characteristics of Satisfied Students
  - 135 Achievement Tests
  - 137 Grade Point Average
  - 137 Class Percentile Rank
  - 138 "success" Rank
  - 138 Age
  - 138 Sex
  - 138 Socio-economic Status
- 138 Classroom versus School Cultures
- 141 Perceptual Similarities between Teachers and Students
  - 142 Ideals: Students vs. their own Teachers
  - 142 Ideals: Students vs. their Combined Faculty
  - 143 Actuals: Students vs. their own Teachers
  - 144 Actuals: Students vs. their Combined Faculty
- 147 The Nature of the Educational Opportunity
- 150 Relationships between Satisfaction and Perceptions of actual classes
  - 153 The General Pattern: Summary, Actuals
  - 154 School Differences
- 155 Relationships between Satisfaction and Perceptions of Ideal Classes
  - 156 The General Pattern: Summary, Ideals
  - 156 School Differences
- 157 Comparison of Actual and Ideal Correlates of Satisfaction
- 159 The Dissatisfied People
- 160 Teacher Satisfaction versus Student Satisfaction
- 165 Conclusions
  - 165 Characteristics of Satisfied Students
  - 167 The Two Orientations
  - 168 Comments on the Two Orientations.

Chapter 9- Educational Benefit: Achievement

- 170 Context of the Inquiry
- 174 Characteristics of Achieving Students
  - 174 The Achievement Measures
  - 175 Age
  - 177 Socio-economic Status
  - 177 Sex
  - 178 Satisfaction
- 178 Summary, by Schools.
- 179 The Achievement Ethos
  - 179 The Actual-Positive Items
  - 181 The Actual-Negative Items
  - 181 The Ideal-Positive Items
  - 182 The Ideal-Negative Items

Chapter 9 - continued

- 182. The Achiever's Actual versus Ideal Class
  - 184 Consistently Positive Items
  - 184 Consistently Negative Items
  - 184 Other Items
- 184 Summary, Achievement Correlates
- 185 Achievement versus Satisfaction Subcultures
  - 185 Actual Correlates
  - 190 Ideal Correlates
  - 195 Discussion

Chapter 10- Education in the Midwestern High School

- 198 The Domain of Discourse
- 200 The Themes: Overview
- 203 Theme 1. Common Expectations
- 205 Theme 2. Instructional Features
- 208 Theme 3. Group Maintenance
- 212 Theme 4. Dialectical Processes
- 214 The Four Themes as Cultural-Statistical Artifacts
- 216 Implications

APPENDED REPORTS

Interview Reports: The Five Schools

By Susan Arisman

- 219 Introduction
- 221 The Community School
- 227 The Interest-Oriented School
- 234 The Trade School
- 239 The General School
- 246 The Academic School
- 250 The Interview Schedule
- 257 Bibliography

ALP-Ethos Manual for Preparing Classroom Vignettes

- 258 Introduction
- 259 Overview: The Strategy of Investigation
- 263 Conceptual Overview: Resume of ALP Theory
- 265 Exemplary Vignette for "Classroom X"
- 271 Detailed Procedure for Preparing Vignette

Technical Notes

- 277 The ALP-Ethos Optically-Read Response Sheet
- 278 Procedure for Judging Socio-economic Status

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIST OF TABLES

29 The ALP-Ethos Instrument

43 Table 1- Numbers of Respondents in the Five Schools

45 Table 2- Composite: Characteristicness, Congruence, and Satisfaction

48 Table 3- "Unusual" Within School Z-Scores

53 Table 4- Summary: Within Schools Diversity

56 Table 5- "Unusual" Between Schools Z-Scores

57 Table 6 Summary: Between Schools Diversity

58 Table 7- Cultural Categories based on Doubly Ubusual Z-Scores

61 Table 8- Discriminant Functions, Between Schools

69 Table 9- The Cultural "Givens"

73 Table 10 The "Hard Realities

79 Table 11- The Value Issue

81 Table 12- Different Concerns of Teachers and Students

89 Table 13- Two Doubly Incongruent Items

92 Table 14- Student Actual Items arranged by Characteristicness and by Congruence-Satisfaction Category

112 Table 15- Tabular Re-Cap of Perceived Issues and Problems

120 Table 16- Items for SA Discriminant Function #1

122 Table 17- Items for SA Discriminant Function #2

124 Table 18- Items for SA Discriminant Function #3

127 Table 19- Items for SI Discriminant Function # 1

130 Table 20- Items for SI Discriminant Function # 2

136 Table 21- Student Characteristics Significantly Correlated with Satisfaction

143 Table 22 Student Satisfaction versus Perceptual Similarity to Teachers

148 Table 23- ALP Actual Correlates with Satisfaction

149 Table 24- ALP Ideal Correlates with Satisfaction

151 Table 25- Actual Items Correlated with Satisfaction

151 Table 26- Ideal Items Correlated with Satisfaction
158 Table 27- Comparison of Actual and Ideal Correlates with Satisfaction
162 Table 28- Comparison of Teacher and Student Correlates with Satisfaction
175 Table 29 - Achievement Tests in Each School
176 Table 30- Student Characteristics Significantly Associated With Achievement.
180 Table 31- Actual and Ideal ALP Items Correlated With Achievement.
183 Table 32- Comparison of Actual and Ideal Correlates with Achievement.
186 Table 33- Satisfaction vs. Achievement: Actual
191 Table 34- Satisfaction vs. Achievement: Ideal.
202 Table 35- Summary-- Significant Item Relationships

Chapter 1 - The Nature of the Investigation

The Variable and the Data

Each classroom has its distinctive culture and way of life. This way of life is experienced differently and has different outcomes for each person--boy or girl, high or low achiever--and for members of different ethnic, social-class, and tribal groups. The teacher and class may view the way of life similarly or differently; and their images may differ in important respects from that which they intend or want. The "overall" culture of the class appears to be a frame of reference for describing individual and subgroup differences and for ultimately understanding how to deal with such issues as making diversity a resource rather than a hindrance, capitalizing on different teaching "styles," adjudicating appropriate standards of performance in the class, etc.

We start with the notion that the class engages in activity and that some activities are more educative than others. For any particular child, engagement in activity would be considered on the educative side if it stimulates his thinking, stirs up awareness of his attitudes, leads him to see choices, clarifies his views, throws useful light on the world, communicates modes of excellence that he is disposed to emulate, etc.; it would be on the non-educative side if it puts him to sleep, tangles him in immobilizing emotions, convinces him that he does not belong in the class, or trains him for failure in the "real" world.

In any particular activity, each child has a somewhat different experience and no activity can be maximally educative or equally educative for all children. Hence one might argue that it makes little sense to talk about the educativeness of "class" activity; one should consider the details of participation of each student. Certainly this conclusion is ultimately correct. Yet among the non-ultimate facts of teaching are that the teacher responds quite significantly to his sense of the group as a whole miniature social enclave; and that the level of "educativeness," about which individuals vary, may in fact be made high or low. It seems a reasonable aspiration to seek activities which are most likely to be most educative for the greatest number of people. Or, in other terms, to develop the classroom into a social system which enhances and supports the educative tendencies of its shared or commonly-expected way of life.

What, then, is this variable that distinguishes a classroom in which most students tend to learn and mature from one in which they mark time or simply go through the motions? The sort of characteristic we seek would be similar to that which distinguishes a high-morale community, office, or congregation that somehow develops and "brings out the best" in its participants from one that is apathetic, careless, and defeated.

The generic term for the property we seek to define is Ethos: "the fundamental character or spirit of a culture; the underlying sentiment that informs the beliefs, customs, or practices of a group or society; the dominant assumptions of a people or period."

Various aspects of Ethos have been conceptualized. Lewin studied "group atmospheres"; Bion investigated "basic assumption emotionality"; survey researchers ascertain "public opinion"; Hutchins wrote about the learning society and Dewey about the inquiring community; Hall analyzed the forms of cultural influence on individuals; Morris compared values across national cultures; Weber related roles to the traditions and societal structures that produced them.

With such a variety of pregnant concepts from which to choose, one must set up selective criteria. For our purpose--to explicate classroom "educativeness"--we must define the Ethos variable in such a way that it is: a) measurable; b) salient in classrooms of different ages, subjects, and purposes; c) sensitive to different styles and methods of teaching; d) relatable to the whole range of established demographic, performance, process, and outcome variables; e) interpretable by means of a well-formulated and adequate theory of education; and f) consonant with established knowledge of society.

The starting point for this research was the development of a method for appraising classroom Ethos. We shall present this method in the next chapter; and the reader may wish to peruse that account before continuing with this overview of the investigations. For the purposes of this chapter, we shall merely tell the reader that the instrument is in the form of a set of statements about classrooms; and that the respondent is asked to use the instrument twice, once to describe an actual classroom he is in and once to describe an imagined "ideal" classroom.

Thus the object of our investigations is the perceptions students and teachers have of "actual" classrooms and of their "ideal" classrooms. The questions to be answered are very much a function of the data we collected, and it may be most helpful to begin by simply telling what data we have.

Our data come from ten junior-level classrooms in each of five high schools. The ten classrooms were selected as follows: two each in English, Mathematics, and Social Studies; with the remaining four sampling the range of other courses. The five schools were selected as follows: one middle-class highly *academic* college preparatory school, one lower class Black *trade* school; one lower class Black "general" school; one traditional agricultural-*community* school; and one innovative "democratic" school oriented to personal *interests* of students. The data are the responses of students and teachers on our recently developed ALP-[illegible]HOS instrument; demographic data on each student (sex, age, socio-economic status, achievement tests, teacher ranking of "success"); interviews with Principals; and teachers' estimates of time devoted in class to various activities.

The questions one can ask of such data are ultimately derived from the various ways in which one conceives of classrooms. In our investigations we conceive of classrooms in four ways.

Conceptions of Classes: The Questions

First, one may conceive of the classroom as a special kind of *social-psychological organization*. *Commonalities* of structure and process among different classrooms would then suggest whatever is inherent in the nature or culture of classrooms as distinctive educational enterprises. *Differences* among classrooms would represent either dimensions of permissiveness (e.g., acceptable alternatives) sanctioned by the general culture; or they would represent aspects of populations, resources, pressures and other expedient circumstances within which the educational enterprise is conducted. Our investigation of the fifty classrooms, then, will seek to identify and classify differences and similarities of structure and process.

Second, one may conceive of classrooms as parts of larger social systems: as manifestations of institutional and communal cultures. To some extent we assume that our ten classrooms in each school represent the institutional culture shared with the other classrooms; and, further, that their population of students embodies the education-relevant aspects of the culture of the community. We shall use the word school to refer to the united influence of both institutional and community cultures. Thus commonalities and similarities among the ten classrooms will help delineate the constraints and alternatives in the mix of community-school-population cultures.

Third, one may conceive of classrooms as agencies for teaching a limited range of subject-related objectives. Differences among the pools of classrooms in different subjects will point to the differences in the pedagogical subcultures and limited instructional theories of subject disciplines. Commonalities across classrooms in different subjects may in part reflect the influence of a general pedagogic subculture.

Fourth, one may conceive of classrooms-in-schools as manifestations of the educational aims and assumptions of a society which includes our five contrasting schools. That is, the five schools may be merged (statistically, at least) into a Composite School which may be said to represent "The School" in such rhetorical usages as "The Schools of the Midwest tend to be......" or "What society expects of school is...." "The School" becomes simply a coherent focus for thinking about the general cultural values and expectations which provide the societal context for educational effort; and this usage is proper. /On the other hand, there is the serious danger that any portrait of "The School" will become the basis for *evaluating all* schools as "good" or "bad." This sort of stereotyping in response to ideological cravings is extremely common, serves no good purpose, divides critics into romantics and realists (or patriots) and discourages studies of how actual classrooms really operate. We have no wish to contribute fuel to such polemical exercises./

Finally, just as schools differ within the larger society and classrooms differ within schools, so individuals differ within classrooms. And, correspondingly, just as education is a function of society, and schools are socializing agents in the community, so classrooms are the locus of individual growth and learning. The analyses indicated in the above paragraphs enable us to consider societal and community purposes and functions. There remains for consideration the effects on individuals. That is, each person has a different experience in the enterprise, and these individual differences are covered up and cancelled out when we talk about particular schools and populations and--even more so--when we talk about The School. We wish, then, to complete the picture by making some distinctions among individuals *within* schools and classrooms. This opens up a very large realm of investigation which could require vast amounts of additional data about personalities, birth order in the family, parental values, and so on. We decided to confine our investigation to two questions. First, who succeeds in school; and what demographic characteristics distinguish high achievers from low achievers? ("Achievement" is chosen as the index of success for the usual unsatisfactory reason that it is about the only measure that exists and it is generally agreed upon as at least an important component of success.) The broader question is of course, who benefits from school; and, usually unexamined, what are these benefits? We expect the differences in perceptions that correlated with achievement will throw some light on the probable benefits at least in the area of individual growth and effectiveness.

The second question we ask is for whom is the school designed? That is, for whom does it provide educational opportunities and for whom does it not? What we are getting at here is that classroom ways of life are more congruent with life-styles of some students than of others. A student who feels alienated from classroom demands and expectations, who places a low value on the activities of the class and a high value on things that are suppressed or discouraged, is not likely to find the classroom an opportunity for personal growth and education. Generally speaking, for example, there is the impression that schools (possibly deliberately) provide maximum opportunities for middle-class, white, college-bound students and minimum opportunities for poor, Black, and welfare or job-bound students.

Our index of opportunity is the correlation between the student's pattern of perceptions of the actual class and his pattern of perceptions of the ideal class. For lack of a better name, we call this variable "satisfaction"; and our question about opportunity boils down to who is satisfied and who is dissatisfied, and what sort of experience does each have in the classroom?

Speaking practically, our investigations may be useful in two general ways. With respect to the 50 classrooms, five schools, and several subjects, we will find out their similarities and differences. These findings have important implications for thinking about action. Features that are common to all classrooms may well represent deeply ingrained cultural assumptions (traditions) about education; and they are not likely to yield to change-efforts. On the other hand, features that vary markedly can clearly exist in different amounts and with different qualities; and if we could understand the other conditions that go along with these variables we could begin to see how to change them--assuming we have some good reason for wanting to. Our point then, is that we hope our findings will encourage more realistic thinking about what can and cannot be done, and about what "forces" will tend to facilitate or resist desirable developments.

Second, the findings about who benefits and for whom the school is designed, will, we hope, be useful to policy-making. The findings should enable us to think much more realistically about who we are reaching, who is penalized, with whom we are succeeding; and it seems to us that such knowledge (rather than politically-loaded stereotypes) is badly needed.

The subject of this first report is an abstraction: The Ethos of the Midwestern High School. Its constant, stable, or unchangeable features are those which five very different but real high schools have in common. Its variable, adaptive, or changeable features are those that differ among our five real schools. We shall identify the constant and variable features of the Ethos of the Midwestern High School; draw inferences about the cultural determinants of these features; identify achievement, demographic and sub-cultural characteristics of the students who are best able to grasp its opportunities; and (similarly) identify the characteristics and sub-culture of students who benefit most as judged by achievement.

Our investigation is primarily a survey. But in order to conduct this survey we have to decide what to look for; and once the data are in, we have to invent ways to turn them into "findings" which in turn, on the basis of certain lines of reasoning, will enable conclusions to be drawn.

Hence we must begin by explaining what is behind the basic data collection device (the ALP-Ethos instrument) the constructs we need to make our data throw light on school and classroom cultures; and the methods of analysis and treatment of the data which constitute the procedures of the investigation.

Our experience with explanations of constructs and methods is that they are easier to understand when one has in mind the phenomena to which they are to be applied. Our phenomena are embraced in the classroom enterprise of five schools, and we would like at this point to share with the reader what we knew about the schools at the beginning of the study. Our information came from extensive (two-hour) interviews with Principals. (These interviews are reported at length in the Appendix.) What we are about to present here is the staff's very brief summary sketches in which we attempted to "catch" as briefly as possible the dominant "flavor"--or Ethos--of the five schools.

Preliminary Impressions of the Five Schools

For the sake of consistency, convenience, and anonymity, the five schools will from here on be designated simply as Community, Interest, Trade, General, and Academic; and various tables will use the corresponding abbreviations C, I, T, G, and A.

The "Community" School

This school shares in the ethos of a predominantly rural, agricultural community. The community expects its citizens to have jobs and to be effective in them. The community's high school is charged with the mission of inducting its adolescents into this work-centered, traditional way of life. The school emphasizes occupational training and basic skills. In the school, success is measured not by grades but by behaving in ways that are appropriate to the worker/citizen role. The expectations of the community at times conflict with the teachers' definition of their professional roles. When this happens, the principal acts as mediator between the school and the community--respecting and understanding both sides.

The "Interest" School

This school is located in a progressive community whose dialogue is dominated by the local university. This university is the major stimulus for change in the community and it strongly influences the School Board and all levels of the school system. The community has come to expect the principal to be an agent of change. The direction of this change is to inspire and legitimate self-actualization of both staff and students. This is believed to require greater individual freedom, as is seen most clearly in the de-centralization of decision-making to faculty and students and in the formal integration of student interests into features of the school program. Other schools may try to respect the individuality of the student, but in this school individual interests are influential on programs.

The "Trade" School

This trade school serves and draws on a very large urban population of poor and blue-collar Black families. It is in the unique position of being able to be quite selective; and it attempts to admit only students who have already established a pattern of success and who have a strong desire for socialization into the adult world of productive employment. The school offers neither escape from the real world nor prolongation of childhood; the students and faculty are seriously engaged in inducting students into the job world. Their shared acceptance of and pride in this mission makes for unusual cohesiveness that is manifested in unusually extensive participation in school events. There is heavy emphasis on spectator sports as an instrument of socialization into informal social dimensions of the way of life characteristic of the blue collar job sub-culture for which the students are being trained.

The "General" School

This school started out to offer middle class education to Black students having unusual promise. It has subsequently taken on more of the character of a comprehensive high school serving a predominantly poor Black neighborhood.

The principal speaks about reinstating the school's glorious past; the assistant principal is concerned with new programs to meet the needs of the present clientele; the community shows a certain suspicion of any changes in programs or emphases. This conflict between past tradition and present demands injects uncertainty into the image of what the school is to become.

The faculty is, of course, part of the official society and it represents that society to the students. At the same time, the effectiveness of teachers also depends on the ability of students who are not part of that society, to identify with them as one of themselves. To make up for these institutional ambivalences, unusual determination must be mustered by each student: he has the sense that he must somehow "make it" on his own. Both respondents agreed that the major factor in the success of students was their luck in finding some teacher who could meet them in a one-to-one supportive relationship.

The "Academic" College Preparatory School

This school is permeated by a strong "cognitive" bias which is reflected in a curriculum compartmentalized both by subjects and by student abilities. The mission of the school is communicated and sustained by high academic norms over which parents as well as teachers maintain continual vigilance. The students are there to strive and the authority which dominates and legitimates this striving is that of the traditional academic "disciplines."

In addition to its unusual clarity of mission, the school is unusual in its strong support for ethnicity. In the school's informal life, students are encouraged to celebrate and nurture their differing sub-cultural traditions and observances--as long as they meet the formal demands of their courses.

The Principal suggests that the strong academic aims of the school are not secured without some possible costs to individual students some of whom may purchase successful preparation for college at the expense of more personal need-meeting.

Rationale

These impressions, gleaned from perceptive and talented Principals, illustrate the kinds of "content" that "Ethos" refers to: traditions, conflicts, aims, processes, policies, expectations--anything that helps shape the way of life. No two vignettes necessarily mention the same specific elements and each pattern hangs together around its own crucial propositions. These vignettes are basically "literary"--the stuff of stories. From the standpoint of our mission, two sorts of questions emerge. First, is it possible that these Ethos patterns--and all such patterns of schools, classrooms, and other organizations--are simply more or less surface manifestations of a few fundamental and universal processes or concerns? And, if that be so, can we identify such concepts and use them systematically to describe and compare different schools and classrooms for the purpose of teasing out cause and effect associations that are useful for improvement of theory, practice, and policy? Second, can these understandings of school and classroom Ethos be connected to the educative effects of classrooms? Do they make a difference to the quality of educaion a student receives, and if so, how big a difference and with respect to what dimensions of functioning? And, of course, underlying both sorts of questions is the problem of method: Can these questions be investigated in such a way that the conclusions are trustworthy as a basis both for further conceptual developments and for the commitment of money and effort in accordance with their implications?

The Organization of This Report

Chapter two presents the ALP-ETHOS appraisal instrument, and the basic theoretical constructs on which it is based, and some anticipations of the problems of interpreting the instrument. Chapter 3 presents the culture-analytic constructs used both to simplify interpretation and also to connect the findings to properties of cultures. Chapter 4 shows the ways the data were treated and also the basic displays of data with which the rest of the report is concerned. Chapter 5 groups the items by congruence-satisfaction categories and then thoroughly discusses each item: its place in the category, its particular contribution, its agreements and diversities. The chapter ends with an overall integrative summary of the Nature and Culture of Classrooms within the School. Chapter 6 studies the within and between school agreements and diversities, and tells what students and teachers (separately) tend to agree on and disagree on, regardless of schools; and also what items are ranked most similarly and differently among the five schools. These differences and similarities are presented both for actual and ideal classrooms. Chapter 7 uses discriminant analysis to identify the processes (actual) and issues (ideal) which best differentiate among the five schools. These processes and issues are of course only partial because they are confined to differences and ignore similarities; but they do point to the dynamics that are most different and therefore are most likely to be points of entry for improving schools. Chapters 8 and 9 present the findings on who benefits and for whom does the school offer the best opportunities for personal self-realization and development of effectiveness. Chapter 10 briefly reviews the summaries in the various chapters and indulges in some more or less editorial reactions by the investigator.

The appendix includes several working papers, including the manual for interpreting classroom profiles, through which the present concepts and design emerged.

But we are getting ahead of ourselves. In order to undertake these investigations, a large and central problem has to be satisfactorily solved, and that is how to assess the ethos of classrooms. Let us now explain our solution and the assumptions and reasoning on which it is based.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chapter 2- The Appraisal of Classroom Ethos

Way of Life

Any collection of people meeting for an hour or more a day in the same location and for the same general purposes will come to know what to expect from each other, what sorts of statements will be latched on to or disregarded, what sorts of private behaviors will be respected, what sorts of pronouncements will be taken as authoritative. In short, the group develops its "way of life"; and this way of life has potentially all the dimensions of the way of life in the family, business or club. But each group patterns the various dimensions in its own way; and the way reflects the particulars of group composition, raison d'etre, environment, etc.

Function

Teachers participate, of course, in this way of life; and through their participation, they modify it. The processes which engender mutual accomodations of students and teachers--and the sense of direction that guides these processes--constitute the operation of the "hidden" or socializing curriculum. These group-developing or culture-building processes constitute the background, the context, the personal-social frame of reference within which the meanings of the foreground planned activities are sought by each student. As everyone knows by now, learning to multiply may be accompained by learning to hate math, by learning that one isn't very bright, by developing attachments to other pupils, by learning to deceive one's parents, and so on. It is probable that the educative significance of the planned activities--things like whether the learnings will ever be used outside the classroom--depend both on the nature of the way of life and on the way the foreground activities are embedded in it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research Design

If some sense of the way of life is required for understanding classrooms, then one would suppose it would have an important place in the design of educational research. In the paradigm of dependent-intervening-independent variables, way of life (or some equivalent) was obviously to be represented in the middle term. But as this paradigm was replaced by more "technical" images of social systems with their input and output variables, the middle term became forgotten except for occasional references to theoretical dynamics concealed in the famous "black box." In our view, "inputs" are whatever considerations influence the way of life and "outputs" are whatever is taken for its spin-offs. Just as the relationship between stimulus and response is mediated by the "organism," so relationships among input and output variables of the classroom social system are mediated by its "way of life." And just as neglect of the organismic term forces one to think of all individual behavior as little more than knee-jerk reflexes, so ignoring the system's way of life constrains one to think of classrooms as little more than machines--regardless of how many "affective" variables one locates in its inputs or outputs.

It is a truism that relationships among variables hold under certain conditions and not under others. For the most part these "conditions" have been either posited as assumptions or have been "controlled" by a few demographic indices. From our point of view, the conditions that most importantly determine how well a proposed relationship will hold are aspects of the way of life. (For example, the present inconsistency of findings of relationships between sex and achievement would probably be explained by differences among the classroom cultures which mediate the salience of sex roles). The endproduct of this line of reasoning is the conclusion that ideas of relationships between variables are to be regarded as propositions to be imposed on the empirical universe; that the object of inquiry is to explain differences in how well the propositions hold from one situation to the next; and that these "explanations" are to become the bases for inferring new propositions to be imposed in further inquiries. It seems to us that such a "dialectical" method of inquiry describes the process of discovery much better than do present paradigms for research. In the child, the "propositions" would constitute his "intuitive sense of the world"; and in action research the propositions would represent policies of operation.

Search for Definition

Getting back to the business at hand, the question is "how are we going to define and represent "way of life" in such a way that its mediative function can be understood?" How are we going to decide what to look for? Clearly we have two bodies of ideas on which to draw. One sort of knowledge is concerned with what we mean in general by "way of life"; the other sort of knowledge is based on observations of what goes on in classrooms. The need for the former theoretical knowledge is to make sure we do not overlook important aspects of classroom life and to increase our confidence that we will be able to interpret our findings to the level of "underlying assumptions" that constitute the classroom Ethos. The need for the empirical knowledge is to help us know in what guise the theoretized aspects may present themselves in actual classrooms. What we seek is something between three scores (e.g., for authenticity, legitimacy and productivity) on the one hand and a mass of details (such as rankings of 24 items) on the other. We seek a limited number of "middle-level generalizations" or themes which tell us the "as-if" intentions of the class: what it expects and values, what it avoids and devalues; and what is "open", ambiguous, or non-salient in its values and expectations.

To find out these things we need an instrument which will be applicable to a great variety of classrooms and which will elicit data from the participants themselves. The one restriction in the population of classrooms to be studied is that the students must be able to use the instrument. As for the instrument itself, some form of Q-sort, as pioneered by William Stephenson, seems the obvious choice. A great deal of art, including statistical treatments, has been developed and none of the experts we consulted had any better suggestions. Operationally, the question, then, is how shall we decide on the 24 or more classroom-descriptive phrases that the students are to rank-order for "how well they describe" whatever classrooms we wish to look into.

The General Concept

At the broadest level of understanding, "way of life" a) evolves adaptively over time; b) is a set of arrangements in which one participates; c) anticipates its own becoming, its emergence into some future state. Thus its three broad aspects are adaptive, participative, and transcendental. These aspects are central concerns in the literature, respectively, on species evolution, community and society, and individual self-realization. Our study of these concepts, to be reported in "Dialogue in Education" (tentative title, 1976) was useful in spelling out the realm of discourse within which "way of life" is to be elucidated.

Our next task was to decide what it is that all ways of life have in common but which they manifest in their own distinctive ways. Since we decided to think in terms of adaptive, participative, and transcendental aspects to characterize ways of life, the common denominator--life itself--must be the dialectical transactions among these components; or, more specifically, the processes through which the development of each aspect both challenges the others and is regulated by their accomodative relationships. At this point, we began to suffer from a severe case of "theory-input overload," and we began looking for some simple proposition to make the ideas manageable. We finally decided on the notion that what all groups have in common is certain "concerns." In short, every group has to be concerned in some way with the authenticity of its operation to the participants; every group has to legitimate its activity in some way; and every group has to be able to distinguish productive from non-productive ways of operating. We noted, with considerable satisfaction, that concern for authenticity would mediate conflict between adaptive and transcendental aspects of life; that concern for legitimacy would mediate conflicts between adaptive and participatory aspects of life; and that concern for productivity (as we defined the term) would mediate conflict between participatory and transcendental aspects of life.

Thus the upshot of the theoretical ruminations was the following reformulation of the question about Classroom Ethos: "What themes can be inferred to organize the pattern of expectations and values of the group through which it manifests its concerns for authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity?"

Aspect Versus Dimensions

In view of the increasingly sophisticated ways in which researchers figure out how much of the total variance is accounted for by different variables, the reader may be tempted to think of way of life as made up of or explained by so much authenticity, that much legitimacy, and this much productivity. That is, to think of the three constructs as representing non-overlapping domains of activity, thought, or Ethos. This is not at all what we have in mind: in our view, these three concepts stand for distinguishable aspects, not *parts* or *elements*. Each aspect represents the whole situation and is appraised from all the data; the aspects are perspectives, not dimensions. We feel that the distinction between aspect and dimension is sufficiently basic to our investigation that we would like to clarify it further by means of an analogy.

If one wishes to reproduce in a picture all the colors of the landscape he may do it with three negatives exposed through red, yellow, and blue filters. That is, these three aspects of the whole scene combine to capture and reproduce all possible colors. In our work, authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity are primary aspects, equivalent to the primary colors. Our reason for considering them to be "primary" is that through them we can bring to bear the basic psychological, societal, and technological knowledge we need to conprehend personal-social-purposive enterprises.

But let us continue. There is nothing in nature that tells one that all colors can be made from red, yellow, and blue. (The discovery of the red, yellow, and blue-sensitive cones in the retina of the eye added powerful confirmation to the idea.) As a matter of fact, by a slight change in the process, purple, orange, and green work just as well. Similarly there is nothing sacred about A, L, and P. Other sets of constructs--if one could only think of them--might work just as well. (How about decision power, scarcity, and equity, from political science, economics, and law?) Treading further through this metatheoretical field, we note that the fact that one uses red, blue, and yellow aspects from which to reproduce all the colors obviously does *not* mean that he thinks everything in nature is colored red, yellow, or blue. In some scenes there may not be *any* red, yellow, or blue. In the same way, we recognize that authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity, however fundamental in our process for reproducing classrooms in thought, may not be at all fundamental in nature. Some other themes might well be more salient in at least some classrooms; they might "explain" more of what the classroom is "really" like. Over time more powerful or universal themes that correspond more frequently and authoritatively to empirical realities may be discovered and used to replace A, L, and P as the fundamental aspects that shape our classroom inquiries.

As we shall presently show, our three concerns generate 24 questions that are meaningful to us (in terms of underlying supportive knowledge), that represent parsimoniously and shrewdly the very large number of specific qualities subsumed under our three concerns, and which, among them, capture the things we judge to be most salient for comprehension. But nature, speaking through the perceptions of our participants, combines these 24 sub-aspects into a well nigh infinite variety of combinations and the object of the research adventure is to identify, name, and explain these empirical combinations; to identify the similarities and differences among them, and to relate these latter to circumstances that produce them and the outcomes that follow from them.

Educational Orientations

It now became necessary for us to address ourselves seriously to the problem of setting down on paper our inventory of the three ALP constructs. Since our instrument was to be applied to classrooms we decided, with some sense of relief, to delimit our constructs to "educative groups." Since it is by no means clear what is meant by "educative groups"--and, in fact, the clarification (ultimately) of this term is a major hope from our research--we decided to make the constructs cover the range of existing orientations. But what orientations shall we consider? Fortunately, as a result of discussions within the faculty on Curriculum and Philosophy four basic orientations had been tentatively identified and they seemed admirably suited to the purpose at hand. These orientations are: a) the "psychotechnical," which assumes that experts exist who know what must be taught and that therefore the job of teachers is to find the most efficient means for teaching it; b) the "discourse" orientation, in which each subject is assumed to have its own mastery of some aspect of the world and therefore the job of teachers is to get the students to become "literate" in the kind of reasoning, analysis, and explanations characteristic of the subject's discipline; c) the "inquiry" orientation in which it is assumed that education is achieved through the process of coping with problems which emerge from the experiences of the students as they coped with earlier problems; and d) the "indoctrination" orientation which assumes that effectiveness of a person depends on his identity being sufficiently anchored by internalized cultural traditions, faith, and purposes.

Examples of these four orientations would be, respectively, use of programmed learning to acquire information and "skills"; becoming a competent writer, historian or chemist; improving one's "full functioning" through participation in community-based action projects; and engaging with other Blacks in a Black Studies program.

Finally, moving closer to the data-level of observations and perceptions, we were ready to consider useful suggestions from the efforts of behavioral scientists to define and operationalize universal dimensions of social systems. From this source, we decided that we should sample personal, interpersonal (interactive), group, societal, and task dimensions of classroom life. And, we further decided that it appears to be so easy to confuse the rhetoric of "what is" with "what ought to be" that we would be well advised to ask our respondents to report them separately. Hence the decision to have students describe their expectation of an actual class (what is) and also, a day or two later, their characterization of an ideal class (what ought to be).

The ALP Constructs

Let us now present the constructs of authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity.

Authenticity

An activity has authenticity for a child if he understands it in such terms that he can participate in it intelligently; if he can assimilate the experience it engenders with past experiences; if it is "meaningful" to him. In authentic activity one is more likely to feel alive, challenged, and turned on; to be able to control the extent and manner of his investment in such feelings. He tends to more listen to others who are accepted as meaningful in the situation. He senses activities as dramatic, as episodes with beginning, middle, and end.

In maximally authentic activities, one is "fully-functioning," one has thoughts, feelings, moods, fantasies; one can, if he is so disposed, examine his experience to find out about himself, others, the nature of ideas and of the world. He is "involved" in the sense of grasping opportunities rather than of defending himself; he admits others as partners and enricheners, not as threats or constrainers.

He is able to respond in many ways, and he feels "free" to make his own decisions and to accept the consequences thereof. Theoretically, the acid test of authenticity would be the penetration of experience to the "inner core," to the self, to the "deepest" levels of "meaning" but in practice classrooms are seldom intended to penetrate to these "deep" levels.

A situation cannot be authentic if it feels artificial, contrived, and trumped up; if its ostensible purposes are sensed to be different from the purposes it "really" serves; if one doesn't know what to make of it or even how to go about finding out what to make of it; in short, if one's past experiences of living cannot be brought to bear on the situation. On the other hand, an authentic situation is not necessarily comfortable, easy, or familiar--"real" life has its stresses and frustrations, too.

Legitimacy

Unlike authenticity which may exist at any level from superficial to deep, some pattern of authority referees conflict in every situation. The question is not "How legitimate is the activity?" but rather "In what terms or on the basis of what authority is the activity legitimated?"

Concern for legitimacy--and for learning "legitimate" behavior--animates the process of socialization. Because activity is shaped by its underlying authority, all educational processes, whatever else they may include, are most fundamentally processes of socialization.

In relation to group life, a legitimating authority is basically a belief. It may be as implicit as a "basic assumption" transmitted in the culture--a value, for example--that people do not know they hold. It may be as explicit as the specification of a special kind of statement required by the logic of an argument. It may be a group norm created from pooled expectations or it may be a consciously, even arduously, legislated agreement on goals, methods, procedures, or recommendations. Legitimating beliefs may derive their authority from group purposes, disciplines of knowledge, career demands, test objectives, societal issues, laws, moral codes, ethnic values, teaching traditions, etc.

Legitimating ideas when understood in their organized context or frame of reference enable an activity to "go beyond" its own particulars and become a prototype or model or analogy for a broad class of enterprises throughout life. In this respect, some present bases of legitimacy in classrooms are inappropriate because they make the analogy false and the prototype trivial.

We rather expect that different bases of legitimacy will correspond with different processes and therefore outcomes of learning. An activity legitimated by middle-class mores ("This is the way nice people behave") invites imitation and shaping through external rewards and punishments. An activity legitimated by a shared group commitment to attain some goal would seem to invite mature reasoning, judgment, and decision-making. The nature of legitimacy may thus imply: the kinds of demands responded to; the characteristics of the learning process; and the species of generalization that will be generated in the learner from his experience in the activity.

Productivity

An activity is productive to the extent that it is effective for some purpose. The purpose may be as clear as completing a defined task or as esoteric as arriving at a needed sense of meeting. It is awareness of purpose that makes means-ends thinking possible, allows consciousness and self-direction, reality-tests self-concepts, and makes practice add up to capability.

Productivity can be regarded as a characteristic of individual students, of the average of a collection of students, and/or of the classroom as a social-psychological entity or group. This third usage will be ours because we wish to assimilate the idea of productivity to the concept of the classroom culture. Our concept of a "productive group" is analogous to the familiar sense of a "productive society."

The classroom would most demonstrably satisfy the criteria of a productive group when it is project or action-oriented. Its effort would be directed to making things, changing environmental conditions, solving problems. It would act purposively and would consciously obtain feedback, assess the situation, and make decisions about how to organize its next effort. It would not only produce, it would learn or develop a methodology of production. These learnings would increase its "power to produce" [which is the literal definition of "productivity"]; and during its activity there would be reflexive changes or modifications of group expectations, standards, role performance, and aspirations. Full and thoughtful participation of the student in these processes would be the most influential route to his development of personal "effectiveness"--especially in situations like the classroom setting.

All classrooms have some component of productivity. The amount and nature of this component depends on its purposes and on the trade-offs among concerns for authenticity (e.g., student-centeredness), legitimacy (e.g., socialization of discourse and way of life), and productivity (e.g., functional adaptation and effectiveness.) Some dimensions of authenticity may be muted in order to maintain productivity; and some legitimating authorities may be suspended in order to enhance authenticity. One supposes that the optimum blend of the ALP components should depend on what part of the educational mission the activity is supposed to be accountable to.

We expect the patterns of relative emphases among these three aspects to differ from teacher to teacher, class to class, subject to subject, and even from activity to activity. One can see gross differences: the bull session that is highly authentic and mostly innocent of societal legitimacy--possibly quite properly so; the programmed learning routine which is directed to its own notion of productivity and leaves authenticity to the teacher; the teacher preparation program which is mostly concerned with only one sort of legitimacy--the traditional expectations of the role of "teacher." As a final example, consider classroom discussions of what is in the textbook. Such subject-matter oriented recitations tend to be legislative discussions. What is being legislated is what one is supposed to think, say, and remember about various topics. To the extent that such discussions are also authentic, they have personal and private meanings; to the extent that the ideas are applied in transactions with phenomena, especially with some purpose in mind, the meetings have a component of productivity.

The ALP Instrument and its Use

The instrument consists of the 24 statements shown below. Each statement is presented separately on a slip of paper. The students are told that they are to use these statements to "describe" their class. Their class may be the one in which they are seated when they take the instrument--an "actual" class; or it may be an imaginary "ideal" class.

THE ALP ETHOS INSTRUMENT: THE ITEMS AND THE DIMENSIONS THEY REPRESENT

AUTHENTICITY

	Item	Category
A2	I felt really challenged by things others said.	"Openness," interpersonal stimulation and/or attack.
A8	It made me think some new thoughts of my own.	Private cognitive stimulation and/or cognitive input.
A9 13	I felt like rapping with the teacher and other classmates after the meeting.	Involvement, closure-seeking; interpersonal trust.
A11 14	I felt that during the activity I could be the sort of person I wanted to be.	Life-style congruence, comfort, role-satisfaction.
A13 15	I felt the activity clarified some previous personal experience.	Assimilation to past private experience; personal "meanings"
A17 21	I was excited by what was happening.	Affective arousal or mobilization; productive or non-productive.
A23 22	I felt the time passed quickly for me.	Unself-conscious absorption; interest vs. distractibility.
A24 23	I felt like contributing to the activity.	Motivation, participation during meetings.

LEGITIMACY

L4 24	As a group we had good reasons for what we did.	Public justification or rationale.
L6 25	Our meetings at times really exemplified good group process.	Model for process; imposed "discipline."
L7 31	We concentrated our activity on the significant aspects of the task.	Significance; focus, directiveness.
L12 32	We understood the nature of our task and tried to see what it would require us to do.	Logical requirements; domination by "curriculum."
L14 33	Some of the things we found out will be useful in other situations.	Future utility; worthwhileness of activity.
L16 34	The problems we had of working together occur regularly in other groups as well.	Process problems, adaptive potentials, reality-orientation; threat.
L21 35	Our shared purpose was strong enough to help guide our behavior.	Common purpose; morale and support; group strength.
L22 41	The issues that troubled us in our group are also prevalent in the larger society.	Societal awareness; ideological conflict; academic "concerns."

PRODUCTIVITY

P1 42	We decided what we wanted to do and we did it.	Decision, group control and/or power.
P3 43	We accomplished a great deal.	Accomplishment and/or achievement.
P5 44	We knew how well we were progressing in our task.	Knowledge of progress; pressure to "achieve."
P10 45	One thing flowed from another.	Continuity, sequence, managerial direction.
P15 51	We ran into problems and solved them.	Problem-solving; exercizes and/or inquiry.
P18 52	The diversity of our individual backgrounds aided the group.	Resource utilization; tolerance of differences; interpersonal confrontation.
P19 53	We all helped each other.	Cooperation or psychological support; formal or informal.
P20 54	We each contributed our special skills to make the meeting productive.	Role coordination; individual effectiveness or worth; communal sense.

NOTE: The official identification of items is by their A, L, or P designation. The two-digit numbers designate the answer spaces on the optically-scanned response sheets. (Appendix)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(They are told which to describe). To set the stage for the task, they are told that these statements are the sorts of things people might say when asked to tell about their class. Some of the allegations may "fit" the present students' class very well, or somewhat, or not at all. It is suggested they read the statements quickly and sort them into three piles: items that definitely apply; items that clearly don't fit; and items that they can't tell about in their first impression. They are then asked to examine the items in each of the three piles, and in each case to rank-order the items for how well they fit. Next they are asked to combine the three piles with the most characteristic or descriptive item on top and the least descriptive (or most suppressed, rejected, or uncharacteristic) item on the bottom. The ambiguous or uncertain items will be in the middle of the pile. Finally, they are asked to record the Identification number of each item opposite the rank they have given it (from 1--most descriptive or characteristic--to 24--least descriptive or characteristic). The record is made on a specially printed optically-scanned response sheet. (Appendix).

Interpretation

These instructions give some hints as to the questions that may properly be asked of the data. First, we don't know how characteristic any item or, for that matter, all of the items, are. It is conceivable that a student might feel that none--or all--of the items "fit" or don't "fit." Whatever his general sense of the descriptiveness of the items, however, he still ranks them *relative to each other*. Thus an item that is ranked high for descriptiveness may fit very well; or it may be ranked high only because the other items fit even less well. Just as the characteristicness of an item is relative to the other items, so also is its "meaning." To different persons and in different situations the meaning of an item may differ. A17, excitement, may mean the high affect that goes with a sense of adventure and revelation; but it can also connote a non-work related affect that accompanies interpersonal attack and defense. In a cognitively oriented procedure-dominated class, "Accomplishment" may stand for "achievement"; whereas in a more open class dominated by personal inquiries, accomplishment may stand for being "turned on," and for feeling gratifyingly adequate or capable. In short, what an item "means" is a property of the whole pattern of 24 rankings. The rank of each item is regarded as a bit of evidence which, along with the other bits, points to the way of life in the classroom. In interpreting the pattern, one must keep digging until he can "explain" the rankings of all the items relative to each other. This obviously puts a heavy burden on the interpreter; and it calls for about the same imaginativeness on his part that would be required to interpret a Rorschach, T.A.T or other projective test.

The interpretation arrived at with projective tests always invites the suspicion that it may represent the projections of the interpreter even more than that of the subjects'. The "instrument" is not merely a list of 24 items and a set of instructions to the respondent. It also includes the carefully defined canons of interpretation to be followed--and the training of interpreters to use them. What one seeks is to "break down" the job of interpretation into a series of sub-tasks each of which is exactly defined. Before the present investigations were undertaken, we spent two years developing a manual of interpretation (ALP Bulletin Number 9, appendix). We found that a seminar of graduate students could use the manual as an agenda for discussion; and that together they could arrive at a pattern that seemed sensible. We found that when the students worked alone, they would tend to hit the same major themes, but would disagree on how the specific items served as evidence. We found that a major uncontrolled difference was with respect to their feelings of like or dislike for particular items. Thus "attempting to understand and meet task requirements," item L12, meant "being imposed on" to some interpreters and "having a work-facilitative structure" to others. In other words, the rule that the meaning of an item must depend on the other items, not on some absolute attribution by the interpreter, remained elusive for some students.

We therefore had to develop a good many further analytical devices, and what we came up with is the subject of the next four chapters. Basically, the solution we reached was to devise two independent and objective ways of subgrouping the items before beginning their interpretation. The constructs used for the subgroupings are congruence, satisfaction, and within and between schools (or classes) diversity. These analytical constructs were derived partly from discovering new kinds of manipulations to which the data were susceptible and partly from further considerations of the nature of "culture." They were not derived from any hidden conception or ideology about what makes classes "educative."

Let us now present the analytical constructs.

Chapter 3 - Formal Properties of Cultural Elements: Analytical Constructs

We have identified four major constructs which may help us to infer elements of culture and cultural patterns within the data. In this chapter we shall present the constructs; in Chapter 3 we shall explain how they are converted into variables and will also display findings with respect to these variables. In the three subsequent chapters we shall use the constructs to collate the data and we shall interpret and discuss the underlying patterns of culture. The cultures of interest will be the "general culture," characteristic of the "composite" school; the local culture, characteristic of the five schools separately, and the generational and role cultures of students and teachers.

Characteristicness

Each respondent is given the same set of 24 ALP items. The items are allegations about student participation in classes. The respondent rank-orders the statements according to how well each statement, relative to the other statements, "describes" or characterizes his expectations of his actual class and separately, the values which characterize his ideal class. What he judges, then, is the extent to which each class embodies the feature or has the character represented by each statement. The most characteristic feature is ranked first and the least characteristic (or suppressed or inapplicable) feature is ranked 24th. The top-rated statements present conditions that are prominent and therefore confidently perceivable. The bottom-rated statements are allegations that one feels do not apply at all well to the class; the features they present are uncharacteristic or even non-existent. A feature may be uncharacteristic because it is irrelevant in the sense that there is no way in which it could be salient; or it may be potentially quite salient but is excluded or suppressed by the basic policy assumptions on which the class operates. In between the top- and bottom-rated features are those that are judged "neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic." In these cases the respondent either does not feel he understands the statement well enough to form an opinion about it; or he feels that the feature is present at some times but not at others.

The effort to describe a culture boils down to identifying some feature--e.g., expectation or value--and then trying to answer how characteristic of the culture is this feature. The answer may be cast in two forms: an estimate of the degree, extent, or intensity of "characteristicness" and/or identification of the conditions and circumstances under which it would be characteristic and uncharacteristic. In our data, the mean rank assigned to an item by a group of students or teachers is the measure of intensity; and its place "within" the overall pattern of 24 items enables one to judge the circumstances.

Congruence

A group holds some beliefs, expectations, and values that are idiosyncratic and not shared with other groups along with some that are so shared. The former give the group its identity, the latter its location within the larger imbedding institution or community. Elements shared throughout the "larger society" are part of the "general culture." The archetypical element of general culture would be one that every person, regardless of age, inheritance, or life circumstances, takes for granted; and, being unable to conceive exceptions or alternatives, the archetypical element could become known to them only as an assumption speculatively inferred from consistencies in their behavior. In ordinary parlance, however, "culture" more typically refers to ideas about which people have become conscious through their recognition of life-styles and behavioral modes different from their own. These life styles may be associated with age, social class, ethnic traditions, careers, section of the country, and so on. Thus a major condition of the characteristicness of an item in the culture is the size, number, and nature of the groups of people who subscribe to it. The more universal the element, the more characteristic it is of the culture of the society that includes all these people and groups.

In our inquiry into the culture of classrooms and schools, the groups of people from whom we have data are students and teachers. We believe that educational cultural elements may be importantly distinguished by whether they are "held" by students alone, teachers alone, neither, or both. The variable of congruence measures the degree to which the mean ranks assigned to an item by a group of students and a group of teachers is the same.

If students and teachers had altogether incongruent expectations and values, we would be tempted to speak of a student culture which is different from the teacher culture. Such differences, for example, are commonly invoked to "explain" classroom difficulties that ensue when a white middle-class teacher faces a Black lower-class group. Considering that teachers and students are of different generations, have different roles, and possess vastly different capitals of experience, we suggest that the items they agree upon may well represent the "broader" popular culture of community and school; and the items they disagree upon may suggest different orientations characteristic of their different positions and responsibilities within the community. The differences should also (one may hope!) be in part due to the teacher's training and indoctrination in professional--as distinguished from man-in-the-street--ideas of education.

The communality that would underlie congruent judgments of the ideal would presumably be values and hopes that are generally shared in the community of discourse inhabited by students and teachers. Since the ideal is a mental construction, what is reported in the ideal is a sort of personal version of more or less commonly celebrated myths about education. In the case of judgments of actual classrooms, there are two proper bases of communality. First, there are the generalized expectations of what classrooms are like, how they differ from families and other organizations, what teachers do, and so on. Participants would, presumably, report these expectations as true of a particular classroom to the extent that there is no contradictory evidence. Second, in addition to these sorts of common expectations implied in rhetorical referents such as "the classroom," there are realities of operation. The actual classroom is very much in existence, students and teachers participate in it, and they see and talk about many features of their experience. It seems reasonable to suppose that teachers and students in the same classroom--like members in any group--will have to develop some common expectations for its procedures, for the different roles of its members, and for the language to be used to describe what goes on. The classroom setting and discourse are represented in a set of relatively stable, quasi-permanent "cultural" elements; and teachers and students, in spite of differences in generation, expertise, maturity, role responsibilities, etc., would tend to perceive these commonalities in somewhat the same way. The common experiences of classroom life would provide the potential for a considerable body of agreements among the participants. The particular agreements actually reached, however, would depend on what is needed in order to maintain social order and predictability, coordinate activity, and rationalize experience. The content of these agreements would be assumptions about purposes, procedures and methods, and supportive beliefs and values. Thus the local culture would emerge; and it might reinforce or be at odds with the "general culture" of the larger social system.

Satisfaction

If a person describes his ideal and actual classes the same way, then we suspect he is pretty well "satisfied" with his actual class. In that case, he should, potentially, be able to "get more out of the class" because he would not be diverting energy into trying to change it or into dealing with his sense of alienation or his feelings of frustration. We shall be interested to find out how satisfaction is distributed among the various groups or types of students and teachers. When we examine singular classes in which our respondents live together and know each other, we expect that our measures of "satisfaction" may be susceptible to dynamic interpretations.

Our data for constructing the composite school come from polling "public opinions" based on the widely varying experiences of fifty classrooms. Our orientation to the interpretation of such data is perforce more sociological than psychological, having to do with inferences about hierarchial and role-related structures of expectations and values in the culture as distinguished from purposive, active, and moral pressures characteristic of single more homogeneous and interactive classrooms.

The dissatisfactions of the composite student body should say something about the place of youth in the educational institution; and, similarly, the dissatisfactions of the composite faculty should speak to the compromises of organizational necessity and expedience with ideas of optimum pedagogical conditions. To the extent that the two patterns of students and teachers are alike, they should say something about the sentiments and expectations of the general culture.

Thus it will be informative to compare and contrast satisfactions of the two groups, that is, to consider congruence and satisfaction together. The first step of interpretation, then, is to classify items on the basis of different patterns of congruence and satisfaction (Categories A-H, Table 2).

Diversity

If all of our 900 or so students ranked item A13 in 6th place, their mean would index a strong consensus and one would declare that the sixth place of A13 is a "fact." Actually, all our items are rated all over the map, usually showing a range of at least two thirds of the possible 24 ranks. That is, their mean is a compromise and it has the meaning of a statistical abstraction which refers to the abstract idea of a "composite" school rather than being an empirical fact that equally well represents the truth about all the students. Considering the differences among schools, classes, and individuals, one would not expect a sharp consensus on the rank of any item, and one would also expect the amount or degree of consensus to vary from one item to another. Items on which students agree unusually well might refer to relatively more salient, obvious, or "objective" features than do other items. Or they might allege thoughts or sentiments that the group felt similarly about--in which case they would be elements in the culture of the group. Following this clue, we are especially interested in items from each school which show unusually small or great diversity of response. Within school similarity suggests the extent to which responses to items might be constrained by the local culture of the school or community.

One may also consider "between school" diversity. If an item is unusually well agreed upon within each school and if the agreement is on the same rank from school to school, then one suspects the items may be part of the broad culture in which all the schools are imbedded. The various combinations of unusually great homogeneity or heterogeneity within schools and between schools should enable us to judge independently of its content the extent to which an item may be part of either the "general societal culture" or the "local institutional culture." (Later on, we shall also be interested in the culture of particular classrooms within the institutional culture of the school that contains them).

Discriminant Functions

The constructs of characteristicness, congruence, satisfaction, and diversity are all applied to assess the possible status of each item within general or local cultures. To arrive at the nature of the culture itself, one must somehow mentally combine the various items, with their different attributes, into a single cultural pattern. An important aid to this combining of items is their classification into various "congruence-satisfaction" and "within school-between school diversity" categories. Items in the same category have at least that much in common, and commonality themes help us see the structure of the pattern of culture.

There is,however, one serious fact about the data which is overlooked in these analyses. That is the fact that the items are by no means independent of or unrelated to each other; there are many significant correlations among the items. It follows that the features alleged by these items represent different manifestations of some more basic hidden or underlying condition. Such a more underlying condition or assumption would be more stable and less subject to local variations and errors than would be each item by itself.

These underlying themes are gotten at more directly as Discriminant Functions which are identified through the method of Discriminant Analysis. The method is highly sophisticated, can be applied only to our data on students, and is applied completely separately from the analyses anticipated above. We have used the method and we report its findings in Chapter 7. We also discuss its technical features more thoroughly in section 12 of the next Chapter.

Summary: The questions about items

Our analytical constructs are to be applied to each item in the four sets (student actual, student ideal, teacher actual, and teacher ideal). How characteristic is the item judged to be? How well do students and teachers agree in their judgments? How well are students and teachers satisfied with the state of each feature? How homogeneous is their opinion within each school and how well do their judgments agree across all five schools?

In the next chapter, we explain how the data are treated to answer these questions.

Chapter 4 - Treatment of Data and Display of Evidence

1. The Population

Each respondent is a student or teacher in one of ten classes in each of five schools. "The School" (or "schools in general") refers to characteristics of the Composite of the fifty classes in the five contrasting schools.

2. The Protocols

Each teacher (T) and student (S) uses the ALP instrument to rate his "actual" class (A) and also (separately) his imagined "ideal" class (I). The four sets of data thus obtained are designated SA, "student actual"; SI, "student ideal"; TA, "teacher actual"; and TI, "teacher ideal."

3. Table 1: Numbers of Respondents in the Five Schools

	Students		Teachers	
	actual (SA)	ideal (SI)	actual (TA)	ideal (TI)
Community	162	169	10	10
Trade	169	160	9	9
General	135	127	10	10
Interest	166	165	9	9
Academic	211	198	10	10

4. Characteristicness

The mean rank of each item in SA, SI, TA, and TI is calculated for each school. The five school means are then averaged, giving the mean rank in the composite. These mean ranks are then rank-ordered from 1 to 24. The figures are entered in columns 3-6, Table 2. Congruence and satisfaction are calculated from these figures.

5. Congruence

a. "Actual" congruence, column 7, Table 2, is shown as the difference between SA, column 3, and TA, column 5. A difference no larger than 3 ranks is considered to indicate congruence and is indicated by a check mark. (The decision to use 3 ranks as the criterion is based on preliminary findings that a difference of three ranks tends to be about equal to the standard deviation of a mean). The figures in column 7, all greater than 3, are taken to indicate incongruence. A plus sign shows that the teachers ranked the item higher (more characteristic) and a minus sign indicates that the students ranked it higher.

Students and teachers are congruent on 16 "actual" items.

b. Ideal congruence, column 8, is similarly calculated. TI, column 6, is subtracted from SI, column 4.

Students and teachers are congruent on 19 "ideal" items. On 13 items they are congruent with respect to both the actual and the ideal.

6. Satisfaction

Satisfaction is ascertained the same way. (a) Student satisfaction, column 9, is calculated as SA, column 3, minus SI, column 4. (b) Teacher satisfaction, column 10, is calculated as TA, column 5, minus TI, column 6. In both cases a plus sign means the item is ranked higher for the ideal than for the actual class.

Students are satisfied on 8 items, teachers on 12. On six items, both groups are satisfied.

7. Diversity

a. Turning now to diversity, the basic information is the standard deviations of the 20 distributions for each item--four assessments in each

Table 2 - Composite: Characteristicness, Congruence, and Satisfaction

- = Student higher   + = Ideal higher
+ = Teacher higher   - = Ideal lower

Category	Item	Means				Congruence		Satisfaction	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
		SA	SI	TA	TI	Actual	Ideal	Student	teachers
A	A24	3	3	2	2	✓	✓	✓	✓
	A8	4	5	3.5	3	✓	✓	✓	✓
	A11	15	14	16.5	14.5	✓	✓	✓	✓
	A9	20	20	18	17	✓	✓	✓	✓
	A13	21	21	19	21	✓	✓	✓	✓
	P18	22.5	22	23	22	✓	✓	✓	✓
B	P3	7	1	5	4	✓	✓	+6.0	✓
	L4	11	15	12.5	12.5	✓	✓	-4.0	✓
	L21	22.5	19	21	20	✓	✓	+3.5	✓
C	L6	14	16	12.5	18	✓	✓	✓	-5.5
	L14	1	4	1	6.5	✓	✓	✓	-5.5
D	P15	2	7	3.5	9	✓	✓	-5.0	-5.5
	L7	10	17	8.5	19	✓	✓	-7.0	-10.5
E	P10	8	13	6	8	✓	-5.0	-5.0	✓
	L12	6	10	8.5	6.5	✓	+3.5	-4.0	✓
	P1	13	6	15	16	✓	-10.0	+7.0	✓
F	P20	16	8	24	10	-8.0	✓	+8.0	+14.0
	A23	18	11	7	12.5	+11.0	✓	+7.0	-5.5
	P5	5	12	11	14.5	-6.0	✓	-7.0	-3.5
	L16	12	23	16.5	23	-4.5	✓	-11.0	-6.5
	L22	19	24	10	24	+9.0	✓	-5.0	-14.0
	P19	9	2	20	5	-11.0	✓	+7.0	+15.0
G	A2	17	18	22	11	-5.0	+7.0	✓	+11.0
H	A17	24	9	14	1	+10.0	+8.0	+15.0	+13.0

of five schools. The evidence is in the form of Z-scores which are displayed in Tables 3 and 5. There are two independently calculated kinds of diversity, labelled "within schools" and "between schools." The within school Z-scores of Table 3 index the average extent of agreement or disagreement among individual responses of all the students or all the teachers within each of the five schools. Thus we can tell which items tend to be most or least agreed upon by student bodies or faculties "in general." The between schools Z-scores of Table 5 are calculated not from distributions of individual scores but from the distribution of the five school means for each item. These means "cancel out" individual differences and thus tell us which items discriminate best or least among the five schools--and, presumably, among schools "in general."

Perhaps we should explain the properties of Z-scores. A Z-score indexes the probability that any quantity within a distribution of quantities is different from the mean of their distribution. If the quantities are individuals' rankings of an item and the mean is the average of their rankings, the Z-score of one of the individuals is the difference between his rank and the mean rank divided by the standard deviation of the distribution. A Z-score of one for an individual means that about two thirds of the other people ranked the item closer to the mean than did this individual. A Z-score of 2 means that he is further out than about 95% of the group. (Z-scores corresponding to various probabilities are shown in tables and are dependent on the shape of the "normal" curve of distributions).

b. When we think about diversity of agreement, the "quantity" of interest is the standard deviation of a distribution. For within school Z-scores, the basic information is the standard deviation of the distributions of responses for an item in each of the five schools. The average of these school standard deviations would characterize the composite school or schools in general. Suppose we obtain the average standard deviations for all 24 items in SA. (for example). What we want to know is which of these composite standard deviations are unusually large, indicating a tendency toward disagreement in schools, and which are unusually small, indicating a tendency toward agreement in schools. "Unusually large" would mean that the standard deviation is significantly greater than the typical or average standard deviation in the composite; "unusually small" would have a corresponding meaning. The "distance" between a standard deviation (of an item) and the average standard deviation (of all the items) would be obtained by subtracting one from the other and then dividing by the standard deviation of the standard deviations.

In our figuring, a Z-score of plus one means that on the average there is unusual diversity of response within schools in general on the item; a Z-score of minus one means unusual unanimity of response within schools on the item. Thus we can find out which items tend to be more agreed upon or less agreed upon (than average) in schools in general. This characteristic is called within school diversity or agreement; or within school heterogeneity or homogeneity.

c. Between school Z-scores ~~measure~~ measures a different kind of diversity. Here we are not interested in the amount of agreement (shown by standard deviations) among individuals within schools. What we are interested in

Table 3: "Unusual" within Schools Z-Scores

ACTUALS

Disagreement

	SA				TA		
Z-Score	Item	M	Range	Z-Score	Item	M	Range
+1.09	P10	8	(4-14)	+1.42	P3	5	(4-12)
+1.11	P1	13	(8-22)	+1.65	P5	11	(5-18)
+1.06	A11	15	(13-20)	+1.32	P19	20	(13-21)
+1.94	A23	18	(11-21)	+1.18	A2	22	(15-22)

Agreement

	SA				TA		
-1.17	L14	1	(1-1)	-1.47	L14	1	(1-5)
-1.57	P5	5	(2-8)	-2.27	A24	2	(1-8)
-1.17	L12	6	(4-10)	-1.07	A23	7	(1-18)
-1.14	L6	14	(13-16)	-1.13	L12	8.5	(5-19)
-2.29	L21	22.5	(18-24)	-1.38	A9	18	(16-23)
				-1.01	P20	24	(19-24)

Ideals

Disagreement

	SI				TI		
+1.25	P1	6	(4-9)	+1.44	A17	1	(2-8)
+1.60	A17	9	(5-16)	+2.10	P3	4	(2-12)
+1.80	A23	11	(5-23)	+1.26	L14	6.5	(1-13)
(+.98)	P10	13	(8-18)	+1.12	L12	6.5	(1-14)
+1.90	A11	14	(6-19)	+1.04	P15	9	(2-16)
+1.48	A9	20	(17-21)	+1.06	P5	14.5	(6-17)
				(+.95)	A13	21	(19-21)

Agreement

	SI				TI		
(-.93)	P19	2	(1-7)	(-.94)	A8	3	(1-14)
(-.95)	A24	3	(1-10)	-1.60	A23	12.5	(5-21)
-1.23	L14	4	(3-8)	-1.08	A9	17	(8-22)
-1.08	P5	12	(9-14)	-1.56	L16	23	(18-24)
-1.28	L16	23	(19-24)	(-.95)	L22	24	(22-24)

is the extent to which the five school means for an item tend to be similar or different. The five school means are averaged to get the grand mean for the composite or for schools "in general." The diversity of the five means around the grand mean is indexed by the standard deviation of the distribution of the five school means. This diversity is calculated for all 24 items and the standard deviation of these 24 diversities is calculated. Between school diversity of any item is then simply the difference between the standard deviation of the five school means for the item and the average standard deviation of the five school means for all the items divided by the standard deviation of the 24 standard deviations. A plus Z-score says that the means tend to be diverse; that is, this item discriminates among the five schools. A negative Z-score says the item means tend to be similar; that is, this item represents a respect in which the schools tend to be alike.

Table 3 shows the within school Z-scores that are larger than +1 (unusual diversity) and -1 (unusual agreement). (In addition the Table includes, in parentheses, Z-scores between .93, and .99 because 1.0 just isn't all that sacrosanct). Student items, SA and SI, are listed on the left side; teacher items are on the right. Actuals are in the upper half; ideals in the lower half. For each item the Table shows its Identification code, its Z-score, the average of its means in the five schools and the range of these school means.

The greatest negative Z-score is for item L21, "our shared purpose was strong enough to guide our behavior" as ranked by the students for their actual classes. (SA). Let us see what this means. In each of the five schools, a large number of students ranked L21. Their ranks covered quite a range. The range is estimated by the standard deviation of their distribution of responses. The actual standard deviations in the five schools for L21, SA, are 5.43, 6.26, 5.94, 5.73, and 5.76. These average to 5.82 for the composite school. This average, 5.82, is the smallest average standard deviation of all the items and it therefore has the largest negative Z-score, -2.29. But let us examine just what this means. In the first place, although the S.D. in the composite is smallest, it does not follow that the S.Ds in each of the schools are their smallest. In fact, it is the smallest in three schools, the second smallest in 1, and the 6th smallest in one. These components,however, average out to the smallest figure of any item. Hence in the composite we say that item L21, SA, is the best agreed upon. In the second place, "best agreed upon" does not at all mean consensus. The mean average rank in the composite of L21, SA, is 20.8. With the corresponding standard deviation of 5.8, this means (technically) that two thirds of the individual scores lie between 20.8 + 5.8 and 20.8 - 5.8, a range of 26.6 down to 15.0. This is a range of 11 points (out of 24 possible), and that certainly isn't much of a consensus. It just happens to be the nearest thing to consensus--or to least diversity--of all the items. (Incidentally, the 26.6 is impossible on a 24 point rating scale; but such are the wonders of statistical probabilities). Hence we refer to L21 SA as the "best agreed upon" item. Since one wants to know what it is that is agreed upon, let us take another look at the mean of 20.8. The range of means for the 24 SA items in the composite is 4.4 to 21.2, 4.4 is the most characteristic and therefore is ranked first for characteristicness; and 21.2 is ranked 24th. Our 20.8 is next to the bottom for characteristicness, and L21 and P18 both have this same mean of 20.8. Therefore we would have to toss a coin to decide which shall be ranked 23rd and which shall be ranked 22nd. Instead, however, we give them both the rank of 22.5.

Our language for all this is to say that L21 is the best agreed upon item in the composite (or on the average) that it is ranked 22.5 and is therefore quite uncharacteristic; and that it tends to be most agreed upon "in all the schools."

In order to get an impression of the range of agreement - disagreement, let us consider the most disagreed upon item. This is P3, "We accomplished a great deal," with a Z-score of +2.10 in the teachers' ideal (TI). The component standard deviations, based on 10 teachers in each school, are: 6.81, 6.47, 7.96, 6.56, and 7.06. The number of items that are more disagreed upon (have higher standard deviations) in the five schools are respectively 9, 10, 0, 8, and 5. Yet the average of these disagreements, having a standard deviation in the composite of 7.03, is the greatest of all 24 items. Hence the disagreement in the composite is greatest even though in only one of the five schools is it the greatest. Proceeding as before, what about the range of disagreement?

Technically, two-thirds of the scores probably lie within a range of twice the standard deviation, namely 14.1. Recalling that the corresponding range for the best agreed upon item is twice 5.8, or 11.6, the difference in diversity between best and least agreed upon items is only 14.1 - 11.6, or 2.5 points. At this point, one may be pardoned for asking whether that difference is large enough to mean anything. Certainly the difference between a range of 14.1 points and 11.6 points doesn't amount to much; one would not expect to see much difference between the two with respect to the amount of conflict or togetherness in the group. Yet the Z-scores, which are both larger than plus or minus 2, tell us that there are only about five changes out of a hundred that these items do not dependably show greater or less diversity, respectively, than the average for all the items. In short, the differences, though small, are dependable and are therefore worth taking as "real." Anything real and dependable is fair game for theorizing; and a theory *built on many such items* of information may very well "fit" practical realities. The fact that the difference, 2.5, is so small only means that we should not form conclusions on the basis of these two items. *Any practical conclusions must be derived from the theory that explains the whole pattern*, not from one or two tiny components--a point which is so consistently violated in educational practice as to deserve being written in large fiery letters.

Finally, while we are examining the caveats of our procedure, let us note one further point beloved of statisticians. This is that the numbers of students are very much larger than the numbers of teachers--on the order of 15 to 20 times larger. If one teacher has indigestion or misreads an item it will introduce an error in the teacher statistics; but it would require 15-20 students equally indisposed to introduce a comparable error in the data on students. More particularly, the school means for teachers are less dependable than those for students. On the other hand, taking the instrument calls for some verbal competence, and this is more likely to be found in teachers as a group than in students as a group. Since is no way to ascertain the probabilities of errors in our data about all we can do is to act as if we believe them and make special efforts to check the reasonableness of inferences against other experiences of ourselves and others.

Table 4 summarizes the vital statistics about Within School Z-scores:

Table 4: Summary: "Within Schools" Diversity

	Student		Teacher	
	Actual	Ideal	Actual	Ideal
Average S.D.	6.62	6.44	6.12	5.86
S.D of S.Ds	.35	.40	.60	.56
No. items with Z-score greater than + 1.0 (diverse)	3	5	4	6
No. items with Z-score greater than - 1.0 (common)	5	3	6	3

Table 4 invites us to consider the balance between cultural constraints that fend to increse agreement as opposed to local particulars that would conduce toward diversity. On the one hand, classrooms differ by subjects, ages, pedagogical methods, material resources, and a host of other reality factors that should produce distinctions within and among responses of students and teachers. These effects should show up in the actual ratings more than in the ideal ratings. On the other hand, to the extent that there are general cultural expectations and values unaffected by local details, individual differences, and accidental rulings, the ideal ratings should tend to be more similar among and between students and teachers.

The figures in Table 4 enable us to test this proposition, to see that it is indeed operative (although not overwhelming) and, to that extent our assumptions about what the ALP actual and ideal measure tend to be supported. Let us consider the data. The mean standard deviation of the 24 student actual items is 6.62 as compared to 6.44 for the ideals. Similarly, the mean standard deviation of the 24 teacher actual items is 6.12 whereas it is 5.86 for the teacher ideal items. Thus students and teachers have slightly better agreement or less diversity on the ideal than on the actual conditions; and students (as befits their lesser experience and attention to classroom variables) agree less well on both than do the teachers. It is interesting also to consider how much variability there is among disagreements (standard deviations) of the 24 items. The standard deviation of the standard deviations-- the measure of variability around the means just cited--is .35 for Student Actuals, .40 for Student Ideals, .60 for Teacher Actuals, and .56 for teacher ideals. This says that teachers vary more in the agreements from one item to the next than do students. That is, they show a greater range from greater agreement to greater diversity among the items. It seems entirely reasonable to suppose that teachers do indeed see more distinctions among items--more nuances and dimensions--than do students; and also that their professional training would bias them toward closer agreement on some dimensions and greater conflict over others.

The data on congruence, cited above, support these interpretations. Students and teachers agree on 19 ideal items and, as expected, on a few less--16--actual items.

The satisfaction data, showing students satisfied with fewer items than are the teachers (eight and twelve, respectively) may reflect more about the power differential between students and teachers than about "cultural" beliefs and values. Nevertheless we would expect teachers by virtue of training and experience to be better able to operationalize and rationalize value criteria and thus to make closer connections between actual and ideal perspectives in classroom life.

Table 5 displays the Between School Z-scores. It is based on item means in the five schools. The range of item means is about 15 ranks for diversity of both teachers and students. The range is much less for similarity--about 2.6 for students and 5.0 for teachers. The greatest diversity or differences among schools is with reference to SI item A23, "I felt the time passed quickly for me," with a Z-score of +2.54. Also very diverse, with Z-scores of +2.26 are the SA items P1, "We decided what we wanted to do and we did it" and L22 "The issues that troubled us in our group are also prevalent in the larger society." The greatest similarity among schools is with respect to TI item L22, whose rank of 24 means avoidance, with a Z-score of -2.14; and TI, A13 "I felt the activity clarified some previous personal experiences," whose rank of 21 means uncharacteristic, with a Z-score of -2.11.

In anticipation of the full analysis, one sees that teachers in general wish for classes that are free of troublesome societal issues (e.g., racial) ranked 24th--and are also unencumbered by private personal needs for clarification--ranked 21st. This would seem to peg classroom life at the level of quasi-public discussion about "safe" content. It is the student bodies who see greatest differences among actual schools; and

Table 5: "Unusual" Between Schools Z-Scores

Z-Score	SA Item	M	Range	Z-Score	TA Item	M	Range
			Actuals Diversity				
+1.24	P19	9	(6-18)	+1.39	A23	7	(1-18)
+2.26	P1	13	(8-22)	+1.12	L7	8.5	(3-21)
+1.61	A2	17	(8-21)	+1.21	L4	12.5	(5-20)
+2.26	L22	19	(9-24)	+1.24	A11	16.5	(6-23)
+1.28	A17*	24	(15-24)	+2.13	A9	18	(6-23)
			Similarity				
	SA				TA		
-1.50	P15	2	(3-6)	-1.77	L14	1	(1-5)
-1.74	L4	11	(10-12)	-1.22	A24	2	(1-8)
(-.97)	L6	14	(11-16)	-1.15	P15	3.5	(2-9)
-2.40	L14	1	(1-1)	-1.00	P19	2.0	(13-21)
				-1.20	A2	22	(15-22)
				-1.39	P20	24	(19-24)
			Ideal Diversity				
	SI				TI		
+2.18	L12	10	(2-18)	+1.10	P15	9	(2-16)
+2.54	A23	11	(5-23)	+1.72	P20	10	(4-19)
+1.48	A11	14	(6-19)	+1.13	P1	16	(7-24)
+1.07	A17	9	(5-16)	+1.08	A9	17	(8-22)
			Similarity				
	SI				TI		
-1.11	P3	1	(1-4)	-1.32	A24	2	(3-8)
(-.94)	A9	20	(17-21)	-2.11	A13	21	(19-21)
-1.33	P18	22	(21-23)	-1.26	L16	23	(18-24)
-1.33	L22	24	(22-24)	-2.14	L22	24	(22-24)

---

*This "diversity" is entirely accounted for by the General School whose mean is 6-9 ranks higher than those of the other four schools. In subsequent analyses we shall not treat this as a "diverse" item.

their most discriminating items portray the class group as decision-maker and societal issues as being troublesome. Apparently societal issues (or awareness of them) is differently characteristic of different schools and the wishes of the teachers don't make them go away.

The summary statistics on Between Schools Z-scores are:

Table 6: Summary: Between Schools Diversity

	Students		Teachers	
	actual	ideal	actual	ideal
Average S.D.	2.91	2.85	4.47	3.86
S.D of S.D.s	1.21	1.58	1.67	1.45
No. items with Z-score greater than +1.0 (discriminating)	4	4	5	4
No. items with Z-score greater than -1.0 (common)	3 (+1)	3 (+1)	6	4

8. Z-score Combinations as Indicators of Cultural Elements

Putting together the within schools and between schools Z-scores, an item might be unusually well agreed upon within schools and its means might be unusually similar among schools. We may reason that such an item tends to be determined (or at least its variability constrained) by the general culture. On the other hand, a well-agreed upon item within schools might have very different means among the schools; and this would suggest the operation of local (e.g., population -specific) norms. Thirdly, an item might show unusual diversity both within and between schools. This would represent an element of cultural permissiveness which may be encouraged by the culture rather than merely unconstrained. Finally, an item may in general show unusual heterogeneity within schools and yet average out similarly from one school to another. This would suggest that some kind of individual difference dynamically maintains some institutional or organizational necessity. Thus, for example, all groups must have some minimum provision of norms for member behavior but these norms may be maintained by interaction among widely different orientations of members.

The items of these various kinds are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7. Cultural Categories Based on Doubly Unusual Z-scores

General Culture	Local Norms	Permissive	Institutional Maintenance
A24, TA, 2.5	A9, TI, 8-22	A11, SI, 6-19	A9, SI, 20
L6, SA, 14	A9, TA, 6-23	P15, TI, 2-16	A13, TI, 21
L14, TA, 1	A23, TA, 1-18	P1, SA, 8-22	P19, TA, 20
L14, SA, 1		A23, SI, 5-23	A2, TA, 22
P20, TA, 24		A17, SI, 5-16	
L16, TI, 23			
L22, TI, 24			
#TA 3	2	0	2
#TI 2	1	1	1
#SA 2	0	1	0
#SI 0	0	3	1

In Table 7, means are shown for items that are similar between schools and ranges are shown for items that discriminate among schools.

The 24 items in SA, SI, TA, and TI make a total of 96 items of which 19 appear in Table 7. An additional 40 singly unusual items appear in Tables 3 and 5.

"General culture" includes five teacher items (3TA, 2TI) and only two student items (SA). Local norms consist of three teacher items (2 TA, 1 TA). Institutional Maintenance includes three teacher items (2 TA, 1 TI) plus only one SI item. Permissiveness, on the other hand, is dominated by students, with three SI and one SA compared to but one TI. While these numbers are small and quite arbitrarily determined by our decision to set"unusualness" at Z-scores +1, it is at least interesting that teachers tend to be much more responsive to cultural constraints than students whereas students are higher in the wish for permissiveness. We shall see later that the item contents in the four categories reflect differences between the needs and responsibilities of teachers and students.

9. Discriminant Functions

Knowledge of the ways schools differ among themselves is of great practical importance for thinking about potentials for change, points of entry, and variables to be taken account of for instructional and curricular purposes. In Table 7, the most school-discriminating items are classified as Local Norms and they were identified through Z-scores. There is a more powerful way to identify local norms and, because of their importance, we decided to use it. The method is called Discriminant Analysis, the computer program is MESA 99, Education Statistics Laboratory, and the researcher who worked out the application to our data is Don Cichon.

Discrimination analysis has two great advantages over the dual Z-score method. First, it combines the two kinds of variance, taking account simultaneously of interrelationships between diversities "within" and "between" schools. (In this respect, it is a species of analysis of variance). Second, it recognizes that the items are by no means independent of each other: there are many significant inter-correlations. What is sought are the common elements that account for the interrelations that best discriminate (or vary most) among the schools; and for the particular items that contribute most to this discriminant "function." The results of the analysis are the weights of each item on each discriminant function, the percent of variance accounted for by each discriminant function, and the score for each function attributed to each school. The information relevant to the nature of "the school" is displayed in Table 8.

One notes that Table 8 refers only to SA and SI because the numbers of teachers are too small in relation to the number of items for discriminant analysis to be applicable to teachers.

We shall use the method of discriminant analysis in subsequent reports to show how classes differ within schools and how subjects differ.

10. The Interpretations

Having explained the variables (chapter 3) and the methods of treating and displaying the data (this chapter), we now move into three chapters of interpretations. Chapter 5 classifies the items into eight combinations of congruence and satisfaction and then considers the common theme underlying each combination. Each item then is examined as a particular manifestation of this underlying assumption. After all the combinations have been analyzed, we attempt to summarize the general, local, student, and teacher cultures from the congruence-satisfaction classifications.

Chapter 6 classifies the items by within and between school similarity and diversity. The general strategy is the same as for chapter 5 and the summary again presents the pattern of general, local, student, and teacher cultures from the frame of reference of diversity: of and constraints on responses.

Table 8 - Discriminant Functions - Between Schools

Student Actuals

Function	1	2	3
% Variance	49.6	25.2	15.6
Items	L12 -.52	A2 -.53	L16 +.65
	P3 -.48	A17 -.43	A9 +.63
	A2 -.44	L22 -.42	
	P19 -.35	P15 -.36	
	A9 -.32	L12 -.31	
		P19 -.31	
Schools:Highest:	Trade	General	Academic
	General	Community	Trade
	Interest	Academic	General
	Community	Trade	Interest
Lowest:	Academic	Interest	Community

Student Ideals

Function	1	2
% Variance	73.3	13.9
Items	L12 -.39	A2 -.43
	A9 -.33	A13 -.42
	P15 -.32	A8 +.39
	L16 -.31	L4 -.36
	A24 +.28	
	A2 -.25	
	A23 +.24	
Schools-Highest	General	General
	Trade	Interest
	Academic	Community
	Interest	Academic
	Community	Trade

Chapter 7 interprets the discriminant functions--that part of the general culture which is freest to vary or, alternatively, those local norms that are most distinctive. This chapter draws on inferences reached in the preceding chapters.

Chapter 5. School Culture: The Way of Life

Life in the classroom is determined by the internalized cultures brought in by the students and teacher as modified by their negotiations in the course of living together. The subcultures most prominently represented are generational (adult and child) and role (teacher and student). To study these subcultures and their interaction, we combine all the students into a single population and also all the teachers. Thus the separate schools and classrooms are not considered in the analysis of this chapter.

The variables to be considered are characteristicness of each item, congruence of student and teacher **rankings**, and satisfaction of teachers and students. These variables are pegged for each itesm, and the items are grouped, for analytical convenience, in the congruence-satisfaction categories identified in Table 2, page 39.

Our convention for congruence is that means of students and teachers are within three ranks of each other. Congruence may be ascertained for actuals and for ideals. Similarly, satisfaction requires that the means of actuals and ideals for students or teachers be within three ranks of each other. Thus we have four dichotomous variables--"Actual" Congruence, "Ideal" Congruence, Student Satisfaction, and Teacher Satisfaction,--and their various combinations are used to classify the 24 items.

The hunch we are playing in this chapter is the proposal of Chapter 2 that the various combinations of congruence and satisfaction might point to different sorts of cultural elements; that our understanding of an item might be greatly enhanced by knowing its combination; and that interpretation might be aided by considering together the items that are similarly classified in terms of the four variables.

Logically speaking, there are 16 possible ways in which four dichotomous variables can be patterned. Of these, eight actually occur in our data and they are shown as categories A through H in Table 2. For purposes of discussion, however, it is convenient to lump several categories together, so that in this chapter the analysis is presented in 5 sections.

Before proceeding to overview these 5 discussion categories we must pause to clear up a statistical detail, in order to avoid confusion in the discussion to follow. The difficulty is an apparent paradox. The students and teachers can be congruent on both the actual and the ideal and they may also rank actual and ideal within 2 ranks of each other. In this case it would appear that both groups must be satisfied. In fact, it may be that one group is satisfied and the other not. L4 is a case in point (Table 2). SA and TA are 11 and 12.5 respectively, averaging to 11.8. SI and TI are 15 and 12.5 respectively, averaging to 13.8. Both are "congruent" because teachers' and students' means are within 3 of each other. Moreover, the two averages for actual and ideal are different by only 2.0, so in terms of these averages the population of teachers and students is "satisfied". (We shall refer to this state of affairs as "population satisfaction" or "students and teachers generally satisfied"). Yet at the same time, the students are not satisfied because SA minus SI is -4.0, which is larger than the 3.0 we require for satisfaction. On the other hand, the teachers are satisfied because TA minus TI is only 2.5, which is within the criterion 3.0. Thus for congruent items we may speak of general satisfaction, student satisfaction, and teacher satisfaction. For incongruent items, only the latter two make sense. This technical footnote applies to Categories B and C; and it explains why it is possible for these to be congruence on actual and ideal and yet have one group satisfied and the other not.

Overview of Categories

Let us now overview the congruence-satisfaction combinations and attempt to explain what sort of information they give us about "cultures".

Category A: Assumption about the Nature of Schools

Parameters: Congruent in actual and ideal. Satisfaction of students and teachers. Actual and ideal ratings the same.

Characterization. Both groups agree on what class is like and that that's the way it should be. The six items in this category define qualities whose presence or absence makes a school a school. Two items A24 ("I felt like contributing to the activity") and A8 ("It made me think some new thoughts of my own") are strongly characteristic. One item A11 ("I felt that during the activity I could be the sort of person

I wanted to be") may (and should) vary among schools. Three items are strongly uncharacteristic of actual and proper nature of schools: A9 ("I felt like rapping with the teacher and other classmates after the meeting"), A13 ("I felt the activity clarified some previous personal experiences") and P18 ("The diversity of our individual backgrounds aided the group")..

Categories B, C, and D. Hard Realities

Parameters: Congruent in actual and ideal dissatisfaction of students, teachers, or both.

Characterization: The common feature of the three subcatagories included in this section is agreement between teachers and students on both the way things are and the way they should be. Since this agreement rules out intergroup conflict over values and over "the facts", the question arises as to why discrepancies exist. The content of the items suggests that students, teachers, or both see the undesirable conditions as necessary hard realities. In subcategory B the discrepancy between actual and ideal is small; the teachers accept it and students are dissatisfied. Students want more of P3 ("We accomplished a great deal") and of L21 ("Our shared purposes was strong enough to guide our behavior"); they want less of L4 ("As a group we had good reasons for what we did"). In subcategory C the discrepancies are somewhat larger and the students accept them whereas the teachers are dissatisfied. Teachers want less of L6 ("our meetings at times really exemplified good group process") and of L14 ("Some of the things we found out will be useful in other situations"). (It is possible that the teachers would blame the students for ~~reluctant~~ overemphasis on these items). In subcategory D the actual and ideal are significantly different and both groups are dissatisfied; it is as if the items represented some external institutional or curricular demand that got in the way. The items are P15 ("We ran into problems and solved them") and L7 ("We concentrated our activity on the significant aspects of the task").

Category E: Role Conflict--Values

Parameters: Congruent in actual; Incongruent in ideal; Students dissatisfied, teachers satisfied.

Characterization: Teachers and students agree on what the situation is like and students wish it were different. The items suggest the issue of students autonomy versus required structure. The data suggest that the teachers are satisfied with the present balance whereas the students want to tilt it toward more autonomy. Thus students would like to de-emphasize P10 ("one thing flowed from another") and L12 ("We understood the nature of our task and tried to see what it would require us to do"). They would like to strengthen P1 ("We decided what we wanted to do and we did it").

Category F: Role Conflict--Concerns

Parameters: Congruent in ideals, Incongruent in actuals; Students and teachers dissatisfied.

Characterization: Students and teachers, in the same classes with each other, profess the same values yet perceive the actual situation differently. This suggests that they are "located" differently or have different "positions" in the classroom society; and that they experience the situation differently. Since on five of the six items they are together in wanting more or less than (the different amounts) they see, the category represents mutual dissatisfaction but different amounts of concern on the part of teachers and students.

On two items, students see more than do the teachers and both groups want more than they see: P20 ("We each contributed our special skills to make the meeting productive") and P19 ("We all helped each other"). On two items, students see more than teachers do and both groups want less than they see: P5 ("We knew how well we were progressing in our task") and P16 ("The problems we had of working together occur regularly in other groups as well"). On two items the teachers see more. In one of these cases teachers and students want less then they see: L22 ("The issues that troubled us in our group are also prevalent in the larger society"); in the other case, students want more but teachers want less: A23 ("I felt the time passed quickly for me").

Categories G and H: Double Incongruence

Parameters: Incongruent in actual; incongruent in ideal.

Characterization: On these two remaining items, students and teachers disagree on both the actual and the ideal. In subcategory G, the students are satisfied but the teachers want much more: A2("I felt really challenged by things others said"). In subcategory H, teachers and students both want much more: A17 ("I was excited by what was happening"). We shall see that there may be conflict involved in the incongruence with respect to A2 because the item probably connotes quite different things to the two groups. With A17, however, the incongruity is only in amount, and teachers and students alike perceive that classes are too dull.

Let us now proceed to the more detailed analyses and finally, to an attempt to pull the details together in the pattern of school culture.

Category A: Cultural Definition of the Nature of Schools

Students and teachers agree with each other as to what the situation is and as to what it should be. Further, they also agree that the way it is, is also the way it should be. It is as if everyone knows what to expect and everyone believes that what is expected occurs and is right. The items in this category seem to act like "givens" in the educational situation. The items are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: The Cultural "Givens"

	Mean Ranks	Actual	Ideal
A24	I felt like contributing to the activity	2.5	2.5
A8	It made me think some new thoughts of my own	3.8	4.0
A11	I felt that during the activity I could be the sort of person I wanted to be	15.8	14.3
A9	I felt like rapping with the teacher and other classmates after the meeting	19.0	18.5
A13	I felt the activity clarified some previous personal experiences	20.0	21.0
P18	The diversity of our individual backgrounds aided the group	22.8	22.0

We are struck by the fact that five of the items are keyed to authenticity, referring to subjective inner experience; and the sixth, keyed to productivity, represents a social condition under which the other five would be supported most strongly. Thus we observe that the dimensions of education most clearly "given" by the culture--that is, whose values are agreed upon and taken as proper--are in the realm of the intra and interpersonal as distinguished, say, from the technical, organizational, or strictly cognitive.

We also note that the ranks of the six items cover the full range of the instrument. A2 and A8 are highly characteristic; they define what a classroom is. A13, A9, and P18 are highly uncharacteristic; they define what a classroom is not. All, middle for characteristicness, is defined as free to vary, to be different from one classroom to another.

Let us now take up each item in turn and in order of its "characteristicness" of classrooms.

A24, "I felt like contributing to the activity". Ranked third by students and second by teachers, this item suggests that one must put forth effort, one must "participate" one must "contribute". Both within and between schools teachers agree unusually well that this is what happens; and between schools they agree unusually well that it ought to happen. Student agreements on this item are unexceptional except that within schools their ideals tend toward unusual agreement. One notes that the problem of "motivating" students is traditionally in the forefront of pedagogical concerns; and that the willingness of students to participate is one process dimension every teacher and almost every parent is continually alert to.

A8, "It made me think some new thoughts of my own". This is the next most characteristic item of the 24. Except for teachers' agreement within schools on the ideal, diversity falls within the unexceptional range. One can associate many popular cliche's to the high acceptance of this item: You go to school to learn to think; knowledge is power; achievement is measured in cognitive terms, as the acquisition of ideas.

Thus the clearly "characteristic" cultural givens are that one participates and that one gains ideas.

> [Narrowly missing membership in this category is L14. "Some of the things we found out will be useful in other situations". Ranked first in student and teacher actuals, the respondents feel it is too much emphasized--their ideal ranks are downgraded to 5.3. Certainly this item would, better than any other, represent the popular justification for education.]

A11, "I felt that during the activity I could be the sort of person I wanted to be". This item is ranked slightly below the middle, meaning that it is neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of schools in general. In our five schools, its rank ranged from 6th to 24th for the actual and 13th to 20th for the ideal. Its value in the composite is thus a compromise; as a cultural "given", what is given is that this quality does and should vary from person to person and class to class. As far as students are concerned, the strong disagreements about this item both within and between schools are ideological--should schools be places where each person can "be the sort of person I want to be?" As far as actual classes are concerned, students disagree most within the schools and teachers disagree most between schools.

It is not surprising to find the students most sensitive to this issue of role satisfaction and adequacy; nor is it surprising to find that teachers in schools serving different social classes tend to have diverse opinions about how true this feature is for their students. If one wanted to raise ideological and theoretical arguments about public education, this would be a good issue to start with!

A9, "I felt like rapping with the teacher and other classmates after the meeting." Ranked fifth from the bottom for characteristicness, the item suggests that in general the private involvements of students and what they do outside of class has little to do with education. But the diversity pattern of the teachers adds another dimension to the interpretation: this item is apparently an index to school climate. Both in their actual and ideal ratings, the teachers within the schools agree strongly with each other but disagree with teachers in other schools.

A13, "I felt the activity clarified some previous personal experiences." Ranked fourth from the bottom, this item presents the clearest possible contrast to the three most characteristic items. It suggests that the characteristic "new thoughts of my own"(A8) are not private or personal thoughts; that "contributing to activities" (A24) means playing the role of student, not engaging in personal quests; and that "learning useful things" (L14) means useful in society, not in self-understanding. The Z-scores show us that this is basically an ideological point: the average teacher ideals among the five schools are extremely close together (the Z-score is -2.11), yet within schools the teachers tend to show unusual disagreements. It is then, a matter of ideological sentiment in general, but also one on which large differences of opinion exist among individuals in any particular setting.

P18, "The diversity of our individual backgrounds aided the group", ranked next to the bottom. Any long-time observer of schools and of the public dialogue in education may feel that this item is not merely considered irrelevant, it is fiercely rejected on two major counts. First, its primary utility would be as a condition in support of A11, A9, and A13 all of which are not characteristic; hence P18 makes little sense. But more deeply ingrained in the popular culture is the myth that "homogeneous grouping"is beneficial and desirable. Regardless of rhetoric, the fact is that who associates with whom in classrooms is probably the touchiest issue in schools (and communities) today and segregation in order to enhance or deny educational opportunities for particular groups is probably the most common political response to newly discovered educational problems. At any rate, both in theory and in practice, capitalizing on "diversity of individual backgrounds"--a key tenet of political democratic ideology--is not part of the educational scene. One further fact should be pointed to before we leave this item: in terms of Z scores, the only finding is that the mean rank assigned by students to this item in their ideal classroom agrees unusually well from school to school, suggesting that the low value on diversity is an element in the age culture and that it cuts across the various social classes of our school populations.

Summary: The Ethos of schooling as defined by these six culturally "given" items would seem to be that school is a place to get ideas and to participate; that school is not a place for individual "therapy", exploration of private meanings, or emotional excitement; that the school regards individual differences basically as an obstacle; and finally, it is expected and proper that students will find some classrooms congenial with the "sort of person I want to be" and others not so congenial.. It would seem to follow that a student cannot expect to be accomodated within any particular classroom but that certain classes, curricula, or programs are likely to fit his needs or style better than others.

Categories B, C, and D. Hard Realities

The items selected into this category are those whose actual and ideal ranks are agreed upon by students and teachers; and one or the other or both groups is dissatisfied. The three items of category B have quite similar average means for actual and ideal; and the students are dissatisfied. The two items of category C somewhat dissimilar means for actual and ideal and the teachers are dissatisfied. The 2 items of category D have very dissimilar means for actual and ideal and both groups are dissatisfied. Having noted these formal congruent-satisfaction dimensions, we shall discuss the seven items in order of characteristicness for actual classes.

The seven items are shown in table 10.

Table 10 The Hard Realities

		Congruent Ranks		Difference	Satisfaction A - I	
Item		Actual	Ideal	A - I	Student	Teachers
L14	Some of the things we found out will be useful in other situations	1.0	4.3	-3.3	(-3.0)	-5.5
P15	We ran into problems and solved them	2.8	8.0	-5.2	-5.0	-5.5
P3	We accomplished a great deal	6	2.5	+3.5	+6.0	(-1.0)
L7	We concentrated our activity on the significant aspects of the task	9.3	18.0	-8.7	-7.0	-10.5
L4	As a group we had good reasons for what we did	11.8	13.8	(-2.0)	-4.0	(0)
L6	Our meetings at times really exemplified good group process	13.3	17.0	-3.7	(-2.0)	-5.5
L21	Our shared purpose was strong enough to guide our behavior	21.8	19.5	(+2.3)	+3.5	(+1.0)

Of the seven items five are keyed to legitimacy (L) and two are keyed to productivity (P). In two cases, P3 and L21, the average mean for the ideal is upgraded over the actual; in the other five cases, the items are less strongly characteristic of the ideal than of the actual class. The two upgraded items appear to relate to purposive work; the five downgraded items characterize external criteria to be met by classroom activity. Thus the picture is one of wanting a greater modicum of accomplishment (P3) and of sense of group purpose; (L21) and of wanting less concern for good reasons (L4), trying to be a good group (L6), learning useful things (L14), solving problems (P15), and focussing on "significant" aspects (L7).

The reason for calling these items "hard realities" is that the dissatisfactions they engender seems to be due less to conflicts between students and teachers and more to necessities which are perceived to be either imposed or inherent in non-educational properties of classroom organization.

Here are the seven items:

L14. Some of the things we found out will be useful in other situations. This popular justification for schools is also taken as generally true (ranked first) of actual classes. According to Table 7, it is part of the general culture with high agreement on the part of teachers both within and between schools. Ideologically, students tend to agree within schools whilst teachers tend toward diverse opinions as to the item's value. As a group teachers downgrade the item from actual to ideal rankings, by 5.5 ranks.

P15. We ran into problems and solved them. This is also top rated (2.8) in the actual but teachers and students agree that it is too much emphasized; they agree that 8.0 is a more appropriate rank on the ideal. Both groups downgrade the item by about 5 ranks. The diversity picture is interesting and clear cut. To the teachers, emphasis on problem solving would ideally be determined separately in each classroom and school--it should be an area of cultural permissiveness. In terms of actual classes, teachers and students average out to about the same means in all the schools. In short, everyone sees classroom work as oriented to "problems" --which might, presumably range from assigned homework practice exercises to meaningful individual or group inquiries; and either because of the constraints of the problem-solving format or because of the wish for more free-flowing or spontaneous interactions, less "problem solving" is wanted. To the teachers this may translate into a desire for more flexibility in pedagogical methods.

P3. *We accomplished a great deal.* The students rank this seventh and wish it were first; the teachers rank it fourth and are satisfied, ranking it fifth in the ideal. Within schools teachers tend to disagree most extremely on the desirability of "accomplishment" and students in various schools tend to place about the same value on it. It is not altogether clear which of two connotations of "accomplishment" may be involved here: *achievement* (cognitive, ideational, useful) or *effectiveness* (personally "meaningful"). Judging by the greater characteristicness of the former, we might assume that the teachers may be thinking of achievement--i.e. test results. On the other hand, the wish of teachers for more excitement (A17), interpersonal challenge (A2) and helping each other (P19) suggest that they are thinking of personal effectiveness rather than achievement testing. Perhaps the existence of these two equally plausible alternatives accounts for the teacher diversity with respect to the ideal. But whichever it may be, we shall see from L21 that the common denominator of the two meanings may be a wish for more thrust, more sense of purpose in the group.

L7. *We concentrated our activity on the significant aspects of the task.* This item, ranked 10th by students and 8.5th by teachers in actual classrooms, is not strongly characteristic. Between schools, the teachers' differ in their assessment of actual classes. Both teachers and students feel that it is emphasized too much; in their ideal classes they downgrade it 10.5 and 7 points, respectively; they are really quite dissatisfied with it. The item can be read as characteristic of effective and important work--in which case it would presumably be valued. But there is another interpretation: that it characterizes activity as very narrowly focussed and as subject to considerable constraint: one must concentrate; only aspects are dealt with; and only "significant" aspects (significant to whom?) are selected; and these are with respect to tasks. In most classrooms, this would require considerable teacher domination of most of the structuring decisions.

Both students and teachers may feel that this sharp focus can be achieved only at the cost of ignoring or denying personal interests and interactive processes that are required to develop readiness and maintain motivation from within.

L4. *As a group we had good reasons for what we did.* This is rated neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of actual and ideal classes. Ratings of actual classes are unusually well *agreed*-upon by students between schools whereas they are *disagreed* upon by teachers between schools. The difference suggests that the item's two components, "having good reasons" and "as a group" may elicit different reactions, with the students responding to the necessity of some minimum rationale for activities and with the teachers responding to differences in morale and "groupness" from school to school. In general the teachers' mean indicates satisfaction with the item whereas the students downgrade it four ranks.

L6. *Our meetings at times really exemplified good group process,* is in the middle range for actual classes and is somewhat downgraded by both teachers and students for ideal classes. Agreement on the actual is, for students, unusually good both within and between schools, suggesting that this expectation is a culturally given aspect of the role of student. The fact that the teachers would like significantly less of this feature suggests that they regard"good group process" as irrelevant (e.g. to achievement) as possibly, doctrinnaire and "ideological", or as a disciplinary feature they wish they would not have to use.

L21. *Our shared purpose was strong enough to guide our behavior.* This is rated as strongly uncharacteristic or untrue of classes, and students within schools agree unusually well on its low rating. Teachers rate it about the same in the ideal whereas the students would like a little bit more sense of shared purpose--but not much (+3.5 ranks). It may be that students sense that a group accomplishes more when its members are not at cross purposes. The concept of the *class* having its own purposes which both discipline behavior and provide some cause to which all may contribute is probably irrelevant to schooling as our subjects encounter it. In the popular culture of education, the idea of an individual having purposes which he pursues is commonly understood; so also is the idea that a teacher "provides" the purposes for the collection of students by telling them what they must do. The notion that there are ideas to be learned--regardless of the inclinations of students and teachers--is also quite clear. But the concept of the class as a group or polity having a will that must be respected and to which individuals must both contribute and accomodate--is not part of the common understanding of classes, however much the principle may be invoked in the abstract and in the name of "democracy".

Summary. Let us now see what interpretations may follow from this critique of the separate items. First, accomplishment is a goal to be enhanced; and it may be partly legitimated by shared purposes. That is, preventing the development of shared purposes denies accomplishment some of the authority it needs for fullest realization and enjoyment. This condition might arise, for example, if accomplishment was defined as a private good to be obtained competitively rather than as a group-supported effort in which one persons accomplishment benefits everybody. In this case, the wish would not necessarily be expressed for a great deal more shared purpose; it would instead be for less of the sort of emphasis on private or secret competitive accomplishment that hinders the spontaneous development of the sense of shared purpose--or morale--in the class.

Second, learning useful things and problem-solving are to be de-emphasized. Some of the energy that goes into maintaining these highly characteristic features should be withdrawn and put into accomplishment. It is as if the class wants utility for the attainment of whatever purposes are met through "accomplishment", not for unspecified "other" situations. Similarly, just solving "problems" may not be felt to enhance accomplishment unless the "problems" represent truly problematic elements in enterprise whose mastery represents accomplishment.

Third, of the three ambiguous items--ranked in the actual class between 9.3 and 13.3--each presents a somewhat different case. "Concentrating on significant aspects of tasks" is actually somewhat characteristic (9.3) and students and teachers feel it is much too strongly emphasized. This feature is probably read as "focussing by the teacher": directing attention, asking specific questions, defining a great many student reactions as "irrelevant" or "illogical" or simply wrong. It directs the class, maintains order, and keeps the collectivity moving through the lesson plan. Under such conditions, "accomplishment" means satisfying the teacher, not attaining one's own goals and enjoyments (although skillful directive teachers do produce *some* of that). It appears that the sort of productivity involved in the students' idea of accomplishment is not machine-like efficiency nor is it processing of teacher inputs; it is instead *comprehension*: finding and organizing into a pattern *many* elements (not just task-related) from all parts of the situation.

Fourth, the next two more truly ambiguous items are having reasons as a group and exemplifying good group process. The middle ranking can be taken to suggest that sometimes these features exist and at other times they are ignored. Thus the class may consider reasons at certain times--such as when the teacher feels they are confused; but seeking reasons together may not be cardinal in their method of operating because the idea of reasons is assimilated to the reduction of anxiety rather than to strategies of production. More striking is the business of trying to "exemplify good group process." Such a demand would arise at some times but not at others; and the times when it would arise are probably when the group is disorderly. In other words, the spottiness of application suggests that it is not instrumental to a continual quest such as for accomplishment. It is instead an ameliorative or corrective device is the service of such values as conformity or politeness or even "participation"--all of which should (when appropriate) be byproducts rather than goals of purposive effort.

Fifth, our data are not about each item as a separate, isolated feature which is inherently good or bad. Our data are about the feature as it is experienced in the context of classroom life. By itself, "concentrating on significant aspects of the task" is a valuable ability called "sharpening" but when it is the teacher who sharpens and the class who merely follows along, then the feeling is different. Similarly, "facing problems and solving them" is surely valuable; but not unless the "problems" respond to or capture genuinely problematical elements in experience. "Exemplifying good group process"--or at least consciously striving to--can be a salutary learning experience; but the reminder (when disorderly) that one must conform to traditional standards of orderliness, punctuality, respect, quiet, etc., may be reacted to as a constraint on performance rather than an invitation to insight. It seems probable that our students were quite capable of distinguishing between features that exist merely as managerial necessities and features that are instrumental to accomplishment.

Category E. Role Conflict--Values

These three items suggest an issue: student autonomy versus technically-facilitative "structure". The statistics are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: The Value Issue

			Different Ideals		Satisfaction	
Item		Cong. Actual	S	T	A - I Student	Teacher
P10	One thing flowed from another	7.0	13	8	-5.0	(-2.0)
L12	We understood the nature of our task and tried to see what it would require us to do	7.3	10	6.5	-4.0	(+2.0)
P1	We decided what we wanted to to do and we did it	14.0	6	16	+7.0	(-1)

P10. "one thing flowed from another". Teachers and students rank this feature as moderately characteristic of actual classes. Students would like to demote it by five ranks but teachers tend only slightly in this direction. Within schools, the item shows unusual dispersion of opinion in the students' actuals and ideals. Individual perceptions apparently depend rather importantly on what one takes the item to signify. The perception of continuity, with "one thing flowing from another", would be enhanced by understanding larger purposes to which each activity is instrumental; and also by sensing some overall strategy by which each new activity can be felt to be consequent on the preceding one. On the other hand, continuity may be perceived rather as the absence of discontinuity and disjunction, as when the teacher has what Kounin calls "thrust". Such a teacher moves the class in a clear and decisive way through the sequence of planned activities. There is no back-tracking and no confused or dead periods of transition. When contrasted with the students' upgrading of P1, their downgrading of P10 suggests that they are reacting more to implied dominance by the teacher of the decision process than to the advantages of continuity per se.

L12. "We understood the nature of our task and tried to see what it would require us to do". In contrast to the above item, students' and teachers' perceptions are unusually diverse within schools and students ideals are unusually diverse between schools. In short, the judgment of the actual condition is relatively objective, but the valuation of the condition varies markedly among the participants. This item gets at the extent to which given tasks dominate classroom activity. The task is assigned; the student must deal with it; and to deal with it he must understand the requirements. The task, then is a source of demands from the "outside". While students and teachers agree on the actual ranking the students feel that the dominance of their activity by task requirements is too strong whereas the teachers feel they would like to be even stronger. The students' reaction is similar to their reaction to P10--and for similar reasons. The teachers, on the other hand, may be expressing the wish for more rationality, order, or discipline.

P1. "We decided what we wanted to do and we did it". This is a very telling item whose results pit the students' desire for autonomy and power against the authority of the task and continuity structure given by the teacher. Both agree that student decision-making is neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic. The students wish it were sixth most characteristic--a very drastic upgrading; the teachers accept it as is. This item is most "subjective" for students; their within and between school actual rankings are most diverse. Their ideals also show unusual disagreement within schools whereas the teachers' ideals, probably reflecting the different education missions of the schools, show unusual disagreement between schools.

P1 is, in effect, in opposition to P10 and L12; it places decisions about demands to be met in the hands of the students rather than as inherent in the nature of problems or in the teachers' lesson plans. The fact that teachers and students agree on actuals but disagree on ideals suggests that the three items in this section delineate a contest of wills--a tug of war between teacher authority and student power.

Category F. Role Conflict--Concerns

Two persons who hold the same values but nevertheless disagree on the "facts" of their common situation are thought to have different personal "needs" which in turn "distort" the perceptions of one or the other or both. When the perceptions are measured by means of groups, the personal needs tend to cancel out, and some other sort of bias must be sought to explain the "distortion". When the groups are students and teachers, the obvious biassing factor is their roles; they "value" the same things but they have different degrees and kinds of concern for particular features. The six items of the present category identify matters about which teachers and students have different concerns. They are presented in Table 12.

Table 12 Different Concerns of Teachers and Students

Item		Different Actuals		Congruent Ideals	Satisfaction A - I	
		S	T		Students	Teachers
P19	We all helped each other	9	20	3.5	+7.0	+15.0
P20	We each contributed our special skills to make the meeting productive	16	24	9.0	+8.0	+14.0
P5	We knew how well we were progressing in our task	5	11	13.3	-7.0	3.5

Table 12 (cont'd) Different Concerns of Teachers and Students

Item		Different Actuals S	T	Congruent Ideals I	Satisfaction A - I Students	Teachers
A23	I felt the time passed quickly for me	18	7	11.8	+7.0	- 5.5
L16	The problems we had of working together occur regularly in other groups as well	12	16.5	23.0	-11.0	- 6.5
L22	The issues that troubled us in our group are also prevalent in the larger society	19	10	24.0	- 5.0	-14.0

Certain relationships appear within the table. The two items that deal with cooperation and support are keyed to productivity and are valued (ideal) most (of the six). The two items that deal with interference by "larger" social and societal difficulties are keyed to legitimacy and are valued least of all 24 items in the instrument. Of the remaining items, one adds more detail to the argument of the preceding section and one is rather anomalous.

Considering the items separately, we find:

P19. "We all helped each other". This is highly valued at rank 3.5 by teachers and students. Students perceive that this feature is moderately characteristic, rank 9; whereas teachers see very little of what they consider to be helping each other--rank 20. In other words, whatever it is that students help each other with is less visible to teachers; and this suggests that it has more to do with the informal processes than with working through teacher-assigned lessons.

P20. "We each contributed our special skills to make the meeting productive". represents the same sort of difference in a more muted fashion. The ideal is lower --rank 9; the students see this feature as relatively uncharacteristic, rank 16, and the teachers see it as the most uncharacteristic of all, rank 24. It is as if the students say that individual contributions to group effort are unlikely and the teachers say they are virtually absent. The students, then are somewhat more aware of special skills contributions unacknowledged by the teachers; and once again these would probably be in the informal interpersonal domain rather than in the achievement and work domain.

P5. "We knew how well we were progressing on our task, is quite prominent in the students' perceptions of actual classes--ranked 5th. The teachers see it as moderately characteristic, ranked 11th. Both feel that it is too much emphasized, and they peg its ideal value at about 13th, which would be neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic or, perhaps more accurately, it would be dominant at some times and irrelevant at others. Given the students' much greater awareness of how well they are doing, one can only conclude that they feel stronger pressures to make "progress on tasks". Given their sense that this is unduly emphasized, they may feel that the pressure is too great. And in that case, their sense of "helping each other" and of "contributing special skills" may be related to means for dealing with this feeling of too much pressure. Too much pressure can be dealt with in two ways. One can either become more efficient and capable, thus making the tasks easier; or he can seek psychological relief from anxiety through informal supportive interaction with others in the same boat. The different responses of students and teachers on P19 and P20 suggest that the way students cope with too much pressure is through psychological anxiety-reducing interactions (that the teacher does not recognize as "relevant" and may even see as disruptive)rather than through task-oriented cooperation (of which the teacher would be quite aware).

A23. "I felt the time passed quickly for me. Neither group feels that this value should be very relevant; they rank it about 12th. But in the actual classrooms, the students say that time drags--rank 18; whereas teachers say that time moves fast--rank 7. Time drags when one is anxious or bored (e.g. subconsciously hostile or deprived); this fits the sense of undesirable pressure noted above. Time goes fast when one is unselfconsciously absorbed in what he is doing--when one is deeply "involved"; and time also goes fast when there isn't enough of it. Both conditions appear to be more likely to be true for the teachers; and the latter possibility would be transmitted to the students as an externally-imposed pressure to get more done.

L16. The problems we had of working together occur regularly in other groups as well, is considered very undesirable by both teachers and students--rank 23. Both see that this condition is moderately characteristic of actual classes, and the students are a bit more aware of this than are the teachers--rank 12 compared to 16.5. The difference, though small, can be readily assimilated to the discussion above; we may assume that the "problems" which both reject have to do with social order and that the students sense disorder as personally punishing whereas the teachers sense it as destructive of work. The work structure is more visible to the teachers and they make it prominent to the point of exerting pressure on students. To the extent that the teacher is wrapped up in work aspects he sees less of the student peer group's internal personal anxiety and frustration. In addition, there is the further point that because of their greater power, age, legitimacy, and professional rationale, teachers would feel more adequate than immature youngsters in the formal work situation; and this would further reinforce the difference in perception of L16.

L22. The issues that troubled us in our group are also prevalent in the larger society is also strongly rejected--rank 24-- by both teachers and students. But now it is the teachers who see this obstacle as more characteristic--rank 10--than do the students--rank 19. Once more we see clear differences in the concerns of the immature students versus the more mature adults. L16 portrayed the students as responding to the personal and interpersonal psychological difficulties typical of "other groups" whereas L22 portrays the teachers as responding to the impersonal issues of the larger society. Both as professionals and as citizens, teachers may be pressured to think more in terms of such issues as fairness, inequities, prejudices, and differentiated expectations or stereotypes applied to groups of children. The students on the other hand, comprehend these same phenomena in much more personal terms, of liking, of psychological threat, and of personal uncertainty and confidence. And, to close the circle of the argument, the distinction between social problems and societal issues adds further weight to the interpretation of "helping" and "contributing" being judged by the students in terms of personal needs and by the teachers in terms of academic task cooperation.

L16 and L22 were designed as probes with respect to a crucial issue in education. Is education for "life" or for academic achievement? If it is for "life", then classrooms should be laboratories for examining the problems and issues of life outside of school; or, at least, for recognizing and learning to cope when these problems manifest themselves inside school. In short, at least a part of the curriculum would include such problems and issues as are actually experienced by students and teachers. Our findings are dramatic and informative: problems and issues do enter the classroom. Life in classrooms does have many of the same problems and issues as life outside classrooms. But--and here is the crucial decision--the educator has to choose whether to respond to these realities and turn them to educational account or whether to try to suppress them, ignore them, or build a utopia in which they don't exist. Our finding is for the latter: in the ideal class, teachers and students agree that these life problems should be most uncharacteristic. In short, the educational mission is defined in such a way that the issues and problems of life which are transported into the classroom by its own students and teachers are obstacles to "education". Conversely, the "educational" mission is "learning" which is very little oriented to social problems and societal issues as actually experienced by students and teachers. To the extent that these problems and issues are both strong and also ignored or treated merely academically--to that extent students may well feel that classroom life is "irrelevant" and teachers may feel that their role is fundamentally impossible of success. In fact, however, our respondents do not characterize these "obstacles" as more than moderately characteristic so that the students' sense of irrelevance and the teachers sense of frustration would probably come into focus only at certain times but not at others.

In this discussion we have held off discussing the Z scores of Table 5 because it seemed more interesting to consider them in relation to the developed pattern of the argument rather than separately for each item. In the first place are three items which are judged unusually similarly both within and between schools; these, we suggested, are components of the "common" or general culture. All three pertain to teachers; and in one case, P20, the finding is in respect to teachers' actuals; in the other cases, L16 and L22, it is the teachers' ideals that are involved. P20 says taat teachers agree especially well regardless of class or school that children do not "contribute special skills to make the meeting productive" (ranked 24th). In short the teachers do not see (or expect to see) the students as individuals each putting out his own special capability to help the group do what it is there to do. In spite of their often professed ideal of cooperation (ranked 9th), teachers perceive virtually none of it. As to this ideal, the average rank of 9 covers up the existence of unusual diversity in the teachers ideal between schools. As we shall see the desirability of capitalizing on the special skills of individuals differs with the purposes of the schools, ranging from 4th in the academic college preparatory school to 19th in the inner city transitional school.

The "common culture" elements in the teachers' ideals for L16 and L22 have already been sufficiently discussed. The Z-score findings simply strengthen the argument. Within schools, both teachers and students show unusual agreement in their rejection of L16 and the teachers also agree unusually well from one school to another. Between schools teachers and students agree unusually well in their rejection of L22, and the teachers also agree unusually well within schools. At the same time, the students show unusual diversity in their actual ratings between schools, a finding which may probably be accounted for by differences in the extent to which "societal issues" are treated as academic cognitive curricular content.

With respect to A23, the rate of passage of time, within schools, teachers show unusually good agreement on their ratings of the actual class. In addition, between schools teachers show unusual disagreement on their ratings of actual classes, probably reflecting real differences in the balance between work and interpersonal orientations from one school to another. Continuing with the actuals, students show unusual disagreement within schools and it seems likely that they should, since in any school students range from bored, apathetic, and hostile to turned on, gung-ho, and successful.

Turning now to the ideal for A23, the findings are less easy to interpret. Should time pass slowly or quickly? If one is enjoying an experience he wishes it to last forever; on the other hand, the quick passage of time is associated with being deeply and effectively absorbed in some pursuit. If one thinks of enjoyment, the ideal is for time to go slowly; if one thinks of effectiveness as the ideal, fast passage of time is its sign. At any rate, these are highly subjective matters, and the finding is that both within and between schools students show unusual diversity in their ideal; and within schools teachers show unusual agreement on their ideal. With respect to P5, knowledge of progress, the unusual agreements and disagreements are all within schools. In both their actuals and ideals, students agree and teachers disagree on this item within schools. The teacher differences are not unexpected, since attention to "knowledge of progress" is a pedagogical element which may well differ from subject to subject and from one style of teaching to another. As for the students some moderate amount of "knowledge of progress" is an uncontestable necessity in the ideal; and the various amounts that actually exist are quite obvious to the students.

Finally, with respect to helping each other, P19, we find that students have unusual diversity of opinion on its actual extent from one school to another, and we may anticipate that informal helpfulness does indeed strongly differentiate student bodies. At the same time, the students' ideals tend to agree unusually well within each school, suggesting that this ideal is closely related to local school climate or ethos. In the meanwhile, the teachers' perceptions of the actual situation are their own. Within schools, teachers tend to disagree unusually strongly whereas their disagreements average out to unusual similarity from one school to another. The expectation of helping and the opportunities provided for it seem, not surprisingly, to vary from teacher to teacher.

Categories G and H: Double Incongruence

The two items in these categories have in common only that they are perceived most differently by teachers and students. Not surprisingly, the items refer to personal feelings and are keyed to authenticity. In the case of A2, the two groups probably read the item quite differently; in the case of A17, they read it the same, want the same thing, but judge the amounts differently.

Table 13 presents the statistics.

Table 13 - Two Doubly Incongruent Items

Item		Actual		Ideal		Satisfaction	
		S	T	S	T	S	T
A2	I felt really challenged by things others said.	17	22	18	11	(-1.0)	-11.0
A17	I was excited by what was happening.	24	14	9	1	+15.0	+13.0

With regard to A2, the students say there isn't much challenge by peers and that that's the way they prefer it. On the other hand, the teachers, while perceiving even less "challenging" going on, wish that there would be a great deal more (by 11 ranks). On the basis of other data, we presume the students read "challenge" as interpersonal attack and the teachers read it as cognitive "stimulation." Considering the low rankings of the other items which would imply constructive utilization of "being challenged by what others said," the students sense of the item seems more realistic. Rapping (A9), clarification of person experience (A13), and capitalizing on diversity of backgrounds (P18) are ranked 20-22 in both actual and ideal. Having guiding group purposes, L21, is ranked 22.5 and 19. Thus interpersonal "challenge" is basically pointless as far as the students are concerned; and hence it is unwarranted--an attack. The teachers, on the other hand, seem to divorce the "challenge" from interpersonal process and to assimilate it instead to the idea of lively, stimulating, and "motivated" discussion. It is part of the means to their ideal for A17 to which we shall shortly turn.

In terms of Z scores, teacher and student actuals are unusual. Teachers within schools judge the actual amount of "challenge" quite diversely;

but their rankings average out between schools. Students, on the other hand, show unusual diversity between schools. For the students, the amount of interpersonal "challenge" or attack differentiates one school from another.

The last item, A17, is "I was excited by what was happening." The students say that of the 24 items this one is least true of actual classrooms. At the same time, the teachers say that it should be most true of classrooms--in their ideal it is ranked in first place. In between these extremes, the students' ideal places it up 15 ranks to 9th place; and the teachers perceive it as actually 10 ranks higher (14th) than do the students. Thus both groups want considerably more excitement than they perceive, but teachers significantly over-estimate the amount of actual excitement when checked against the perceptions of students. On the other hand the teachers may be speaking for themselves: they do feel somewhat excited by what is going on.

In terms of Z scores, rankings for the ideal amount of excitement are unusually diverse for students both within and between schools and for teachers within schools. This is clearly a very subjective item for students, and "excitement" may apparently mean anything from turned on to anxious.

Grand Summary:

The Cultural Pattern of the School: Characteristicness

The preceding discussion has examined the pattern of variables for every item. The analysis attempts to "bring out" as many meanings as possible; and thus this chapter presents the ruminations basic to the next two chapters as well.

Out task now is to begin to try to call these details to order: to select one or more clear frames of reference which enable us to select among the details to make a coherent pattern. In the present summary, our ordering principle will be characteristicness. In the next chapter it will be diversity, and in the one after that it will be discrimination.

The data display for the summary based on characteristicness is shown in Table 14. The columns, A-H represent the categories of satisfaction-congruence. The rows represent the mean of items in order of their rank in Student Actuals. Thus our frame of reference is how the students see their actual classes and the other three frames are assimilated into the item's classification in the columns. We arbitrarily divide the ranks into top, middle and bottom thirds--corresponding to quite characteristic, ambiguous or spottily characteristic, quite uncharacteristic. These names, of course, are relative to each other and may or may not properly label segments along a continuum of "absolute" judgment. Finally, and it cannot be over-emphasized, the pattern of SA does not necessarily represent any actual class. But if one uses statistics at all he has to play the statistical game, which in this case says that an average represents a central tendency; and the central tendency is the best guess (in the absence of any other information) about what the situation is in general.

The Top Third

There is general agreement on the actual and ideal ranks of the top four items. Learning some things useful in other situations (L14) is ranked first, and teachers say it is over-emphasized by 5.5 ranks.

Table 14 - Student Actual (SA) Items Arranged by Characteristicness (Rank) and by Congruence-satisfaction Category

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G&H
		Hard Realities Dissatisfied					
Rank	Defining Assumptions	Stud.	Teach.	Both	Value Conflict	Role Concerns	Doubly Incongruence
1			L14				
2				P15			
3	A24						
4	A8						
5						P5	
6					L12		
7		P3					
8					P10		
9						P19	
10				L7			
11		L4					
12						L16	
13					P1		
14			L6				
15	A11						
16						P20	
17							A2
18						A23	
19						L22	
20	A9						
21	A13						
22	A18						
23	L21						
24							A17

Facing and solving problems (P15) is second and both students and teachers think it is over-emphasized (by approximately 5 ranks), Feeling like contributing (A24) and Thinking new thoughts (A8) are cultural givens which define schooling. These four items characterize schools as places to learn useful things, have new thoughts, actively participate, and tackle "problems."

The next four items relate to the task structure. It is oriented to accomplishment (P3) and students want more. This is monitored by knowledge of progress (P5) and students think that is over-emphasized. The strategy of accomplishment is through meeting task requirements (L12) through continuity of effort (P10). Students feel the former is over-emphasized whereas teachers would like a little more. Both feel that P10 is a bit too strong. Thus the students place a high value on accomplishment but they tend to downgrade the pedagogical features through which "Accomplishment" is to occur. It is probable that these features do not in the eyes of the students, provide the operational definition of what they mean by accomplishment. These three features--task requirements, knowledge of progress, sequencing--do constitute the basic operations of programmed learning, mastery learning, and lesson planning in general.

The Bottom Third

The anchoring items for "uncharacteristic" are defining assumptions, category A, about what schooling is not. These are: I felt like rapping outside of class (A9), Clarification of previous personal experience (A13), and capitalizing on diverse individual backgrounds (P18). To these may be added L21 which misses the category only on a technicality: Shared purposes strong enough to help guide behavior. These four items would portray a psychologically supportive and encouraging community; and, according to the students, this is what classrooms are not. It is not surprising that students rate "excitement" A17 as least characteristic of classes. What is curious is that students and teachers accept the non-community but not the lack of excitement that would be one of its major consequences. Teachers apparently pin their hopes for excitement on being "Challenged by what others said" (A2) which they want a great deal more of (11 ranks) whereas students, in the absence of the supportive community, are satisfied to keep the "challenge" as is (ranked 17th).

Also relatively uncharacteristic as far as the students are concerned is the class being "troubled" by issues "prevalent in the larger society," (L22); to teachers, this condition is quite characteristic (ranked 10th). Both students and teachers would like it to be ranked 24th. (A non-community has no means to deal with "societal issues"). Finally, "time passed quickly for me" is rated uncharacteristic by students (and the opposite by teachers). The students wish it were more characteristic (by 7 ranks) and this would seem to fit their wish for more excitement and less domination by technical procedures (e.g., not closely connected to accomplishment).

Thus the uncharacteristic student items say that classes are non-communities; are not and should not be part of the larger society (e.g., issues); are very unexciting; and are relatively unchallenging (interpersonally) places where time drags.

The Middle Third

In this section we find one defining assumption, that "being the sort of person I want to be" (A11) is expected to vary from class to class. There are three "hard realities," that the group "had reasons for what it did" (L4); that at times "we really exemplified good group process" (L4); and that "we concentrated our efforts on significant aspects of the task" (L7). Both groups want less of this focussing; students want less of "reasons" and teachers want less of "exemplifying good process." Yet these features must exist in some degree as the conditions required for the technical features to be effective.

One item represents genuine conflict in values: "We decided what we wanted to do and we did it" (P1), ranked 7 higher in the ideal by students. The remaining three items in this middle group were classified as role-related concerns: teachers and students agree on the ideal but perceive very different amounts in the actual situation. In 9th place (next to the top 8 items) the students place "we all helped each other" (P19); and they wish it were in second place (right after accomplishment). Similarly the students put "we each contributed our special skills to make the meeting productive" (P20) in 16th place but wish it were 8th. The teachers on the other hand rank both of these in the actual class at 20th and 24th respectively. The remaining item is "The troubles we had of working together occur regularly in other groups as well" (L16). Students are more aware of this moderately characteristic feature, but teachers and students would like to eliminate it (ranked 23rd in ideal).

The Basic Pattern--A Concise Interpretation

The classroom is a place to participate and to think new thoughts. It is partly oriented to utility and to coping with "problems." The means of education are working on tasks, knowing how well you are doing, and having a smooth sequence of activities. In this operation students have a sense of accomplishment but they wish for a great deal more.

The classroom is not a personally-suportive milieu nor does it have other aspects of community. Students feel relatively unexcited, emotionally uninvolved, unstimulated by diversity or challenge, untroubled by societal issues, unsupported by shared purposes. They feel that time drags and that personal private experiences are irrelevant.

In this situation, some students can be the sort of person they want to be; and others cannot. At times the technical procedures need to be bolstered by discussing reasons for them, by consciously trying to maintain order, and by efforts to focus on what is "significant." Students wish they had more say in decision-making. They help each other informally and, to a lesser extent, with expertness; but this is not a built-in instructional feature. Students also are aware of interpersonal problems typical of "other groups" and would like to be rid of them.

Chapter 6- School Culture: Subsystem Similarity and Diversity

We have been investigating school culture as a set of assumptions on which schools appear to operate. We identified the general cultures defining assumptions within which each school develops its own climate and procedure of operation. We thought of this operational culture as emerging from negotiations between students and teachers. Each group was seen as having its own role: the teachers are there to teach, to enact the role of teacher, to give "structure" to facilitate achievement of the class (primarily seen as a collection of separate individuals). We found that the task-achievement structure, set by the teachers, tends for the most part to be accepted by students and teachers; and that their dissatisfactions with it tend to be somewhat different. Students tend to wish for more part in decisions and for less constraint by the structure. Teachers tend to be more satisfied than students with the structure but to be less satisfied with some of the measures (e.g., disciplinary and focussing) required to maintain it. Both groups wish students would help each other more and both groups wish the class would be a lot more "exciting." Neither group views either the actual or ideal class as a community whose shared purposes are to be achieved through differentiated but coordinated efforts of all the participants.

This portrait of "the school" or of "schools in general" establishes a sort of base-line from which any actual school will deviate. The question arises, then, of what part of this portrait would tend to fit all schools and which elements would vary among schools: How are schools alike and what dimensions discriminate among them? The answers to these questions have important practical implications for thinking about strategies for school betterment. The features that are most different from school to school are variables; they are shown to be able to exist in different amounts under different conditions; hence cause and effect relationships can be discovered and, in theory at least, changes can be made. On the other hand, features that are alike and invariant no matter how different schools are from each otherwise are obviously not very sensible as targets of change. Even if change could be made, it would be temporary because one wouldn't know what other conditions would have to be altered to reinforce the change and keep it from "falling back" to the old norm as soon as the active change agents were withdrawn. Or, to put the problem of change more generally, the target of change must be a whole pattern of operation and it is only for the variable elements that we can ascertain the components of the pattern.

The data needed to identify the variable and invariant elements are measures of "within school" and "between school" similarity or homogeneity on the one hand and diversity or disagreement on the other. These data are displayed in Tables 3 and 5, and we shall now discuss these displays.

Table 5 is concerned with differences and similarities of means among the five schools (between schools Z-scores). Table 3 is concerned with differences and similarities of responses (standard deviations) within schools (within school Z-scores). In both cases, data are shown for actual and ideal classrooms as perceived by teachers and by students. Thus there are eight questions to be answered with respect to each table. We shall answer them first between schools and then within schools. After that, we shall see what emerges from the two sorts of diversity as shown in Table 7.

Between Schools - Actual Classrooms

What do students see as differences among actual classrooms in the different schools? Table 5 shows four such discriminating items. These items are P19, helping each other; A2, being challenged by what others say; L22, being "troubled" by societal issues; and P1, deciding what to do and then doing it. These four items refer to interpersonal-affective dimensions: they index the social-psychological "climates" of the schools. In short, the way schools most differ in the students' perceptions is as interpersonal milieux.

Having seen how schools differ in the eyes of the students, let us see how they are most nearly alike. The pertinent items are L6, exemplifying good group process--ranked 14th; L4, group having reasons for its activity--ranked 11th; P15, facing and solving problems--ranked 2nd; and L14, learning some things useful in other situations--ranked 1st. The goal is practical (utility); the method is problem-solving (or exercise-practicing). At times (or in some lesser degree) reasons have to be understood and the class has to be consciously held to the norms of good (orderly?) groups. Discipline, reason, problems, utility, it is hard to imagine a classroom which does not require these features for its own viable operation. What the students perceive in all classrooms thus appear to be institutional necessities inherent in the generic nature of classrooms as organizations.

Let us now consider what differentiates schools in the eyes of teachers. The pertinent items are: A9, rapping outside of class; A11, being the sort of person I want to be; L4, group having reasons; L7, focus on significant aspects; and A23, time passes quickly. These dimensions of interpersonal trust, absorption in work, role satisfaction, having reasons, and significant focus--would seem to characterize good and adequate students who would get a lot out of class. The differences between schools that teachers most respond to thus are in their view of the adequacy of students as learners.

In what ways do teachers see schools as alike? The items are A24, feeling like contributing--ranked 2nd; L14, useful learning--ranked 1st; P20, utilization of individual skills for the group--ranked 24th; P19, helping each other--ranked 20th; A2, interpersonal challenge--ranked 22nd; and P15, problem-solving--ranked 3.5th. Teachers perceive that schools are alike in the facts of student participation, "useful" learning, and address to problem-solving. They are also alike in the very low utilization of individual skills, of helpfulness, and of interpersonal stimulation. These items portray students as a collectivity of separate participants in the program of class activities; and they do not see the students as functioning members in a purposive and supportive group.

It seems clear that the "Adequacy" dimensions that differentiate schools in the eyes of teachers are confined to the development of individual competence and do not include effectiveness in interdependent purposive enterprise.

Between Schools--Ideal Classrooms

We turn now to the image of the ideal class and how it differs among the populations of the different schools. Let us proceed as above, considering the SI items that are most diverse and then most similar between schools. Then we shall conduct a similar analysis for TI.

The items on which student ideals differ most from one school to another are A11, being the sort of person I want to be; A23, time passes quickly; A17, being excited by what happens; and L12, understanding the nature of tasks and trying to meet their requirements. (The ranks all average out to between rank 9 and 14). In short, the values which differentiate students in the various schools are personal congeniality or 'fit,' absorption, excitement, and acceptance of and challenge by tasks. A student who marked all these high would be seeking a place in which he could live with security, affect, and engagement in competency-building jobs. A student who marked these low would be seeking a place in which he could be uninvolved, passive, an outsider. Put this way, the difference seems to be in zest, risk-taking or growth-producing challenge versus unobtrusiveness, non-risk, and non-effort--the syndrome of the time server.

The items on which student ideals are most similar among schools are: rapping outside the group--ranked 20th; P18, capitalizing on diverse backgrounds--ranked 22nd; P3, accomplishing a lot--ranked 1st; and L22, group "troubled" by societal issues--marked 24th. The one positive agreement is on the value of accomplishment; the other three ideological agreements are with respect to avoidance of threat--from diversity of personal affects, of group subcultures, and of positions on social issues. The ideal class would be one that is comfortably homogeneous socially and thus devoid of threats to personal-social adequacy. In this perspective, "accomplishment" would refer to technical competence, not to development of maturity for complex living. One suspects that these findings may be quite age-specific; an attribute of 16 year-olds who as yet have no real place in the productive political-economic-social society.

Turning now to teacher ideologies, the items by which teachers are most differentiated from school to school are: A9, rapping outside of class; P15, facing and solving problems; P1, group decision-making; and P20, utilization by the group of individual's skills. (These average out respectively to ranks 17, 9, 16, and 10). The construct which these items develop is of the group as an effective agent: it is cohesive in that members trust and accept each other's affect; it has a will which influences choice of activities, it expects and uses diverse capabilities for its own progress; it copes with problematic situations. Ideologically teachers differentiate schools along the continuum from a mildly coping community to a strongly technical learning collectivity.

Next we consider the items which represent ideological similarity of the teacher groups across the schools. The items are: L16, our problems occur also in other groups--ranked 23rd; L22, we were "troubled" by societal issues--ranked 24th; A13, the activity clarified previous personal experiences--ranked 21st; and A24, feeling like contributing to activity--ranked 2nd. With the exception of having "motivated" students, the common values represent avoidance of personal and social "real-life" problems and issues--a wish to be free of the various sorts of "hidden agendas" that influence motives and social orientations. Or, to put it another way, in the classroom most commonly sought, students would be severed from "outside" affective preoccupations and personal concerns. They would give full attention to the neat puzzle-type learning activities set up by the teacher. /One cannot refrain from observing that classrooms are social in nature; that teachers do "socialize" students into these small enclaves (whether they know it or not); and that insofar as the enclaves ignore the hidden issues and problems which the students are working on in a perforce subversive and off-target way, the "socialization" is maladaptive for life anywhere except in the classroom./

Within Schools - Actual Classrooms

The between schools analyses just presented deal with the ways in which expectations and values differ from one population of students and teachers to another; that is, from school to school. The similarities suggest the influence of a general culture which embraces all five schools--perhaps, even, the whole Midwest. The differences suggest the dimensions that vary within the general culture; or, if one prefers, the salient characteristics which differentiate subcultures.

Now we turn to a similar analysis of similarities and diversities among persons in the same school. To avoid the uniqueness of any particular school, we select dimensions that tend to be diverse or similar in all five schools; that is, we work with the average standard deviation of items across five schools rather than with the standard deviation of one, hopefully "typical" school. Our findings, then, will be of similarities and differences within the average institutional subcultures of schools:

Table 3. We shall first consider diverse and similar perceptions students have of actual classes, SA; then the teachers perceptions of actual classes, TA; next the students ideals, SI; and finally the teachers ideals, TI.

The items on which students perception of actual classrooms differ most are: P1, group decision and action; A11, being the sort of person I want to be; P10, one activity flowed from another; and A23, time passed quickly. (These *average* out to ranks 8 to 18). The general theme seems to be autonomy. Thus P1 says that the students have the power to make decisions affecting their own welfare; A11 implies the power to adapt the situation to one's own needs--or to accommodate oneself effectively to the situation. P10 can be read to imply that one is enough in control to see how one's activity "casuses" and builds on another; and A23 implies that one engages in activities that are meaningful to himself. These four characteristics would seem to describe an autonomous person rather well. The major disagreements among students within a school are with respect to *how autonomous they really are.*

The items students perceive most similarly in their classes are: L6, at times exemplifying good group process--ranked 14th; L21, guidance from group purposes--ranked 19th; L14, useful learning--ranked 1st; L12, meeting task requirements--ranked 6th; and P5, knowledge of progress--ranked 5th. The common core seems to be oriented primarily to collective *individual achievement*: one undertakes tasks, uses feedback to correct and perfect responses, and thus learns things necessary for accomplishment of future tasks. A modicum of social order is required as a condition for this work and it is obtained through conscious effort to be a "good" group rather than through the discipline of shared group purposes--i.e., through "conditioning" rather than insight.

From the standpoint of the teachers, the diversity among their classrooms is with respect to these items: P19, helping each other; A2, challenging each other; P3, accomplishment; and P5, knowledge of progress. (these average out to the range from 6 to 22). P5 and P3 imply a sense of sequence and A2 with P19 suggest interpersonal dynamics of challenge and support. The underlying theme appears to be some sense of dialogic process as applied to cognitive achievement; (Lacking L21, A13, and P1 the dialectic is far from full-fledged).

As to similarities perceived by teachers, the pertinent items are: A24, feeling like contributing--ranked 2nd; L14, useful learning--ranked 1st; P20, utilization by the group of individual skills--ranked 24th; A9, rapping outside of class--ranked 18th; A23, time passes quickly--ranked 7th; and L12, meeting task requirement--ranked 8.5th. The components of the construct are thus motivation, practicality, absorption in tasks, along with lack of personal affective involvement, and isolated skill development. The orientation is thus to motivated performance on assigned tasks in a social-emotional vacuum.

Within Schools--Ideal Classrooms

Items within schools on which SI is unusually diverse: A11, being the sort of person I want to be; A23, time passed quickly; A17, I was excited by what happened; A9, rapping outside of class; P10, one thing flowed from another; and P1, group decision and action. (The range of average ranks is 9 to 20). These six items include all four that turned up under student diversity in the actual. In addition, for the ideal we find A17 and A9. These two items beef-up the interpretation of the other four as suggesting the theme of autonomy. A17 adds affective response and A2 adds interpersonal trust. The common new component is emotionality which adds depth to the quality of *autonomy*.

Items within schools on which SI is unusually homogeneous: A24, feeling like contributing--ranked 3rd; L14, useful learning--ranked 4th; P5, knowledge of progress, ranked 12th; L16, typical problems of groups--ranked 23rd; and P19, helping, ranked 2nd. Students tend toward agreement on three of their four most highly rated values: motivation, utility or practicality, and supportive helpfulness. (The top value is accomplishment). P5 is instrumental rather than an end in itself; and L16 is a condition to be avoided. All five items contribute to the conditions of *effectiveness in the role of student* and other items which would point toward more personal meaningfulness are absent. The values on which students tend to agree best, then, are those from the popular culture that characterize a "good" student.

With regard to teacher ideology, their greatest diversity is with respect to these items: P15, facing and solving problems; A13, clarification of personal experience; P3, accomplishment; L14, useful learning; L12, meeting task requirements; P5, knowledge of progress; and A17; excitement. (Except for A13, the item means are ranked 14 and above). These items are those in the ALP instrument that most clearly *describe* the instructional structure: it is oriented to useful accomplishment; its activities are problem solving and task achievement; it is monitored by knowledge of progress. The condition of excitement is interesting in this connection: if the student is turned on, this structure frees him for effective adventure;

but if the student is turned off, the structure hems him in and traps him in dullness. It is easy to see why teachers rate excitement their highest value. As for the relative rejection of A13, this too is instrumental to making the pedagogic structure effective: the injection of unshared private and personal concerns into the structure simply distracts, diverts, and vitiates the class activities' momentum, clarity, and equity of opportunity.

But given all the above arguments, why wouldn't these items be the best rather than the least agreed upon? The answer may be that they represent the central elements in teaching method and teaching method is and should be responsive to differences in subjects, students, style, and pedagogic theory. The differences in these items, then, may be legitimated by professional concerns; and professional growth would be indexed by the continual reassessment of these features and their values for educative effort.

With regard to homogeneity or *similarity* of values, the salient TI items are: L16, group has typical problems--ranked 23rd; L22, class troubled by societal issues--ranked 24th; A9, feel like rapping outside class--ranked 17th; A8, think new thoughts-- ranked 3rd (and not quite meeting the required level of significance) and A23, time passes quickly--ranked 12½th. In the preceding paragraph we found great variability with respect to the core features of instructional method; now we find great agreement on the avoidance of personal-social problems, societal issues, and personal emotionality that would interfere with the bland "thinking of new thoughts" and with absorption in work. These then, are the conditions under which pedagogic methods confined to the professional dimensions identified above, would work most effectively.

In short, the teachers agree most in their liking for a trouble-free, absorbed, cognitively stimulated class--a collective tabula rasa which is highly receptive to their pedagogical methods.

Summary: Differences and Similarities Between and Within Schools

We shall now attempt to concoct one-sentence characterizations of the answers to the 16 questions just discussed. The answers with respect to similarities, agreements, or homogeneities will be flat statements of what is or ought to be. The answers with respect to diversities, discriminations, or heterogeneities will characterize continua, poles, or issues along which classrooms would be differently located.

Between Schools

Q1. What are the major differences students see in actual classrooms located in different schools?

A1. Personal growth producing versus non-growth producing interpersonal milieu.

Q2. What are the major similarities students see in actual classes located in different schools?

A2. Generic organizational necessities: utility, reasons, discipline, problems to tackle.

Q3. What are the major differences teachers see in actual classes from school to school?

A3. Adequate students who get a lot out of class versus inadequate students who get little out of class.

Q4. What are the major similarities teachers see in actual class from school to school?

A4. Classrooms as collectivities of students taking part in programs of activities; students not functioning members within a purposive and supportive group or classroom community.

Q5. What are the *differences students* in different schools see in their *ideal* classrooms?

A5. Growth producing challenges versus time serving.

Q6. What are the *similarities students* in *different* schools attribute to *ideal* classrooms?

A6. Accomplishment that is not threatened by diversity of emotionality, of group subcultures, and of different societal ideologies.

Q7. What are the *differences teachers* in *different* schools see in their *ideal* classrooms

A7. Mildly coping community versus technically dominated learning collectivity.

Q8. What are the *similarities teachers* in *different schools* attribute to their *ideal* classrooms?

A8. Avoidance of personal and social "real-life" problems and issues characteristic of the world "outside."

Within Schools

Q9. What *disagreements* do *students in any school* tend to have with each other in their perception of their *actual* classes?

A9. How autonomous they really are in their classes.

Q10. What are the major *agreements students* in *any school* have with respect to their *actual* classes?

A10. Individual achievement strategies in a sufficiently orderly environment.

Q11. What are the major *disagreements teachers* in *any school* tend to have with respect to their *actual* classes?

A11. Extent to which student dialogue exists as an aid to (cognitive) achievement.

Q12. What are the major *agreements teachers* in *any school* tend to have with each other about their *actual* classes?

A12. Presence of motivated performance on assigned tasks in a social-emotional vacuum.

Q13. What are the major *disagreements students* in *any school* tend to have in their visualization of *ideal* classrooms?

A13. (Same as A9, except that the definition of autonomy is broadened in the ideal to include more affective dimensions.) How autonomous students *ought* to be.

Q14. What are the major *agreements students* in *any school* tend to have about their *ideal* classrooms?

A14. Students should be "effective" in their role as students.

Q15. What are the major *disagreements teachers* in *any school* tend to have in their visualization of *ideal* classrooms?

A15. Relative emphasis on technical features of instruction and on how exciting it ought to be.

Q16. What are the major *agreements teachers* in *any school* tend to have about their *ideal* classrooms?

A16. Avoidance of personal-social problems, societal issues, and personal emotionality: "a trouble-free" cognitively-absorbed class.

Comparison of Within and Between School Perceptions

The answers to the 16 questions were obtained separately as independent inquiries. It is therefore striking and gratifying to see so many cross-relationships within Table 15.

Consider the students. The concept that captures their *differences* of perception of both actual and ideal classes within schools is autonomy. And the concept that captures their discriminations among schools is that of the school as an interpersonal milieu which fosters or discourages autonomy; and whose aim is growth production or (non-autonomous) time-serving. The features students see most *similarly* within schools are achievement procedures which are recognized as pretty much the same from one school to another. Their most similar ideal is to use these procedures effectively as students; and, the diverse populations of students idealize (as the environmental condition for autonomy and for effectiveness) freedom of threat from diverse personal, social, and emotional differences.

Consider the teachers. Within schools, they most agree that performance is motivated and exists in a(psychologically) non-interdependent collectivity. They see schools as most alike in fostering performance within the instructional program; and they also differ in how adequate students in different schools are in this performance. Within schools the teachers disagree on the extent to which there are useful dialogic components in their classes. In their ideals, the adequacy of students is assimilated to differences in the values of a rather weak communal sense as distinguished from straight domination by procedures. /In general, the more "inadequate" the students, the more dominant the technical processing/.

Table 15- Tabular Recap of Perceived Issues and Conditions

	Students Actual	Teachers Actual	Students Ideal	Teachers Ideal
Between Schools: Issues (Diversity)	A1 Quality of Interpersonal Milieux	A3 Adequacy of Students	A5 Growth-Facilitation vs. Time-serving	A7 (Mildly) Coping Community vs. Procedure-Dominated Collectivity
Conditions (Similarities)	A2 Organizational Necessities	A4 Collective Performance in Program	A6 Lack of Threat from Personnel Diversities	A8 Avoidance of "Real-life" "Outside" Problems and Issues
Within Schools: Issues (Disagreements)	A9 How Autonomous Students Really Are	A11 Extent of Dialogue to Aid Achievement	A13 How Autonomous Students Ought To Be	A15 Proper Emphasis to Place on Instructional Features and on "Excitement"
Conditions (Agreements)	A10 Achievement Procedures in Orderly Environment	A12 Motivated Performance in Socio-emotional Vacuum	A14 Effectiveness in Role of Student	A16 Trouble-free Class; no Personal, Social, or Societal Problems.

The differences in teachers' perception of the extent of dialogue are assimilated to differences in the valued pattern of emphases on the structuring components sought in their method of teaching. The similarities among schools with respect to the prominence of collective performances is assimilat4d by the students to the desirable condition of lack of personal threat and by the teachers to avoidance of social-emotional interferences. And the teachers agreement within schools on the prominence of motivated performance is assimilated by the students to the value of effectiveness as a student and by the teachers to a trouble-free easily managed class undistracted by emotional and ideological preoccupations.

The Four Kinds of Cultural Elements

There remains for examination in this chapter the concept of culture as constraining opinion, thus increasing its uniformity or agreement; or, oppositely, as encouraging or at least allowing and protecting diversity of opinion. From this standpoint, items with greatest agreement both within and between schools would suggest elements of the "general" culture. Elements with greatest diversity both within and between schools would suggest the greatest range of tolerated alternatives--or openness-- within the general and local cultures. Elements showing greatest agreement within schools and greatest diversity among schools would suggest local cultural norms; and items responded to most diversely within schools but most similarity between schools would suggest some sort of inherent organizational or institutional necessities that are maintained dynamically through interaction of differentiated roles, views, or emotionalities.

Table 7 shows the 19 items (out of the possible 24 times 4 or 96 items) that fit these combinations.

We have already noted that 4 out of 5 of the permissive items are from students; and 4 out of 5 represent ideals. On the other hand, 5 out of 7 of the doubly constrained general culture items are from teachers; and 5 out of 7 represent actual conditions. The trend is thus very much what one would expect: that there are more alternatives or less constraints on ideological than on factual conditions; and that teachers, with their professional responsibility for the schools, will have more agreement on what schools are like and less diversity in their views as to what schools should be like.

At the same time, the local norm items--all 3 of them--are from teachers; as are three of the four institutional maintenance items. These items are in the domain of authenticity (P19 might as well be keyed to A as to P); and this suggests that the two categories have to do mostly with school climate.

Turning now to the more detailed analysis of the four elements:

General Culture

With respect to these doubly similar or constrained items, we reasoned that it is as if the five school populations were one single homogeneous population with respect to these items and that therefore these items may be elements of a larger culture which includes all five schools. Since our schools are urban and small town, adjustive and college preparatory (etc.), the culture to which they all belong must be very extended or inclusive, and it might be thought of as the educational culture of the Midwest.

The ALP elements that belong to the presumed Midwest Culture are of two sorts. Five of them describe common expectations of what all schools are like; two of them refer to what teachers wish they were like. Thus: students and teachers agree that classes and schools are places to learn "some things" that "will be useful in other situations." And teachers agree that they "feel like contributing to the activity." Teachers also agree that schools are not places in which individual "special skills" are capitalized on to "make the meeting productive." In addition, students agree on the perception that at times their meetings "really exemplify good group process." With respect to ideology, teachers wish that the class would not be subject to "problems of working together that are typical of other groups" nor would the classes be "troubled" by "issues prevalent in the larger society."

In the larger culture, then, at least some learning is to be useful. Beyond that teachers are active contributors to activity and teachers wish classrooms to be free of social and societal troubles and problems. The students agree that there are efforts at times to act like a good group--presumably meaning that the class has to be called to order from time to time. Finally, the productivity or success of the class does not, in the eyes of teachers, depend upon utilization of special skills of students.

Local Norms

These items are pegged differently by each school or local community, and they represent dimensions of permissiveness or pluralism within the larger society. Both items are generated by teachers, not by students.

The teachers in each school tend to agree with each other on how "quickly time passes for me." But in one school, they rank the item first and in another 18th for characteristicness. With respect to feeling like"rapping with others outside of class," the teachers in all the schools tend to agree unusually well with their colleagues but their mean ranks between schools range from 6th to 23rd. With respect to how desirable "rapping" is, the range is 8th to 22nd.

As far as teachers are concerned, each school has its own standard or norm for personal emotional involvement and absorption in activity and these norms range from strongly supportive to rejecting of this feature. Putting these two sections together, the general culture includes the teachers' wish that classrooms will be free of group problems and societal issues; and each school will then be free to determine for itself just how personally and emotionally its teachers will be involved in class activities.

Permissive

As might be expected, the greatest diversity is with respect to ideological matters that are unconstrained by hard realities. Of the five items in this category, only one refers to actual classrooms, and that one is judged by the students; it is "We decided what we wanted to do and we did it." The disagreement on this item within classes probably reflects the whole spectrum of student relationships to the class and teacher: a student who finds the activity congenial tends to identify with the teachers' plans as if they were his own; a student who feels alienated tends to sense that decisions and plans are "arbitrary" and are "imposed" by the teacher. Between schools, the level of student decision-making varies with pedagogical method and philosophy. The more "open" the school, the more decisions for action are made by the students; the more "preparatory" or "basic" the less student interests are seen as properly influential. The item may be seen as indexing the power and/or dignity of the students vis-a-vis the teacher and the established tradition.

Institutional Maintenance

The agreement among schools on all four items in this category is that these items are quite uncharacteristic. Within schools, however, there is unusual diversity of opinion. Two of the items are from the teachers' actuals: A2, "I felt challenged by things others said" and P19, "We all helped each other." For teachers, more than for students, these items may be ambiguous. To the students, "challenge" probably tends to mean "attack." To the teachers it may mean either attack or stimulation. To the students, "helping" probably means helping in the sense of Winnie-the-Pooh: personally encouraging or ego-building; to the teachers it probably means both psyche (informal) and socio (formal, task, organizational) assistance. With respect to the teachers' ideals of A13, clarification of previous personal experience, the extent to which education should be concerned with private experience is a matter of debate among teachers--especially teachers of different subjects--and the between schools agreement may well be accounted for by the selection of the same sampling of subjects in the five schools. With respect to the student ideal for A9, feeling like rapping after the meeting, this is subject to the same disagreements as A11, A17, and A23; it presumably has to do with desired or "needed" amount of emotional involvement of the person.

The items in this category do not lend much support to the hunch that the cultural elements stand for organizational stability maintained through interaction among differentiated views, beliefs, or emotions. The similarities between schools seem merely to be due to similar averages emerging from heterogeneous distributions. Yet the similarities of content among A9, as interpersonal emotional support, P19 as interpersonal voluntary helping each other, A2 as interpersonal stimulation (with the connotation of trust), and A13 as privately meaningful--cry out for further explanation. Perhaps all that can be said is that the common theme is clearly uncharacteristic of the cultural definition of schools--that is, it is locked into a larger pattern; and that the within school diversities simply represent the sensitive resonance of the items to deeply personal (and heterogeneous) needs of individuals.

Discriminant functions represent alternative patterns, ways, or styles of life which exist and overlap in varying degrees in classrooms. The patterns are statistically selected to represent coherently the differences among schools. The data come from five relatively large populations of students in the five schools. The data consist of their rankings of the 24 ALP items for actual classes and for ideal classes. The question asked in the analysis is what patterns of items account for the greatest differences between the distributions of responses in these five populations. Three functions account for 90 per cent of the variance in the student actuals and two functions account for 87 per cent of the variance in the student ideals. The teacher actuals and ideals could not be analyzed because the number of teachers is too small for the number of items. For technical reasons (to meet the necessity of independence among items) one item had to be left out. The one we chose was L14 because it is the least discriminating of all the items).

Each of the 24 items "contributes" to each function, but in different amount. The weight of the contribution of an item is indexed by the "standard coefficient." To define the function or the way of life it represents, one starts with the items which have greatest weight and then adds items of successively less weight as long as they enrich and strengthen the interpretation of the pattern. Thus we find that we can work with 10 or 12 items in spelling out each pattern.

The structure of the patterns differs among discriminant functions.

Nevertheless when one is dealing with modes of life, he tends to look for some variant of a basic meta-theoretical model: that one set of considerations is opposed by or is in conflict with another set; and that some third consideration adjudicates, resolves, or balances the opposing matters. Thus a mode of life is understood as an ongoing dynamic.

Here are the discriminant functions.

Discriminant Function #1, Student Actuals

This function accounts for 49.63 per cent of the total variance; and it is significant at the .0001 level or better. Its composition is shown in Table 16.

Table 16- Items for SA Discriminant Function #1

Standardized Coefficient	Item No.	Abridged Content
.52	L12	Meet task requirements
.48	P3	Accomplish a great deal
.43	A2	Interpersonal stimulation
.35	P19	Help each other
.32	A9	Rapping outside class
.28	P1	Decide what to do; do it
.21	L21	Shared group purposes
.20	A17	Excitement
.19	L6	Good group process
.18	A13	Personal meaning

The pattern begins by defining a confrontation, represented by L12 and P3. The students have a way of meeting this confrontation, represented by items A2, P19, and A9. Certain other features go along with this action-reaction couplet; they represent facilitative conditions and outcomes. These items are P1, L21, A17, L6, and A13. The interpretation:

Certain tasks are set for students and, because of their wish for accomplishment, they attempt to understand and meet the requirements of the tasks. This is the confrontation.

They meet these requirements interactively: they stimulate or challenge each other's ideas; they help or support each other informally; they use each other outside of class to work through their anxieties. This is the means, the reaction. (Of course, they do a lot of other things too,but these other things do not differentiate one school from another).

In the process of coping, they are supported by the sense of shared purposes, they are bolstered in making their own decisions based on previous personal experience, they cooperate, and they experience high affect or excitement.

So goes the model. In the trade school, the confronting tasks are eagerly accepted as exercises through which one learns a trade; this school has most of this way of life. In the inner-city general school the tasks are imposed academic requirements; and this is the next strongest manifestation of this mode. Next in intensity is the open democratic interest school, in which the tasks are self-chosen projects; but other modes are also important. In the communityschool, the "tasks" are related to learning traditional roles, and the mode is immersed in many other dynamics of socialization. Finally, in the academic college prep school, the students are much more oriented to learning ideas than to dealing with specified tasks and the mode is much less represented in this school. Thus the mode operates in all the schools in different amounts and in different ways, and its underlying pattern is highly discriminative.

Discriminant Function #2, Student Actuals

This function accounts for 25.19 per cent of the variance; and it is significant at the .0001 level or better. Its composition is shown in Table 17.

Table 17 - Items for SA Discriminant Function #2

Standard Coefficient	Item No.	Abridged Content
.53	A2	Interpersonal challenge or attack
.43	A17	Excitement
.42	L22	Troubled-societal issues
— — —	— — —	— — — — — — — — — — — —
.36	P15	Face problems
.31	L12	Meet task requirements
— — —	— — —	— — — — — — — — — — — —
-.31	P19	Negative: Helping each other
— — —	— — —	— — — — — — — — — — — —
.26	P18	Diverse backgrounds helpful
.25	A11	Be sort of person I want to be
.25	A13	Personal meaning
— — —	— — —	— — — — — — — — — — — —
.22	L4	Group reasons for activity
.23	L6	Group exemplifies good process
— — —	— — —	— — — — — — — — — — — —
-.23	L7	Negative: Concentrate, focus on significant task aspects.
— — —	— — —	— — — — — — — — — — — —

The pattern begins with an existing state of affairs which embodies a great deal of exciting interpersonal and ideological conflict. (Items A2, A17, and L22). This conflict is echoed or reinforced at a lower level by their not helping or supporting each other (Item P19, negative). The vehicle or occasion for the conflict to be expressed is the official agenda of problems and tasks (P15 and L12). This agenda is supported by good reasons and it provides the impetus (such as it is) for orderliness (Items L4 and L6); but the agenda does not really focus effort (L7, negative). In the meanwhile, the students find the conflict not only exciting (A17) but also meaningful (A13), congruent with their own way of life (A11); and they draw on their own differences in "background" (P18) to keep the conflict going.

In short, the dynamic is one of trying to work through personal social-ideological conflict in the group through direct attack on each other's positions and personal ideas.

In the different schools, this mode is strongest in the inner city general school for whose students life both inside the classroom and on the block has a good deal of this quality. It is least intense in the "open" school in which the emphasis is upon an individual's pursuit of his own interests in small groups and projects. In the middle is the academic college preparatory school, in which the mode is probably a concomitant of quite intense competition for grades and status. The explanation of the community school's second place and the trade school's fourth place will have to await more analysis of the other data from these schools. Off hand one wouldn't expect the trade school to be very high because it is highest on discriminant function #1; and it is hard to see how a school could be high on both #1 and #2. As for the second place of the community school, the dynamic is much more covert but it may be highly instrumental to the major mission of the school which is to give students a place in the community--a possible euphemism for deciding what slot each person is to occupy.

Discriminant Function #3, Student Actuals

This function accounts for 15.57 per cent of the variance and it is significant at the .0013 level or better. Its composition is shown in Table 18.

Table 18 - Items for SA Discriminant Function #3

Standard Coefficient	Item No.	Abridged Content
.69	L16	Typical problems of working together
.63	A9	Feel like rapping outside of class
.39	P19	Help each other
.39	A17	Excitement
.38	A8	Think new thoughts of one's own
.23	A2	Interpersonal challenge
.26	A23	Time passes quickly
.29	L22	Troubled by ideological-societal issues
.21	L12	Meet task requirements
-.22	P1	Negative: We decided what we wanted to do and we did it.

The two powerful anchor items, L16 and A9, concisely describe a complete interaction: "We had problems of working together; and these problems occur regularly in other groups as well": and "I felt like rapping with the teacher and other classmates after the meeting." This is an illustration of the classical principle that when the formal structure gets into difficulties the informal structure takes over. When a group has process problems--and especially those which remind participants of other equally difficult situations--the person may feel inadequate and anxious; in which case he may seek out a friend to rap with and "get hold" of himself. (This is certainly a major reason why a person needs friends and, conversely, why people without friends may feel pretty inadequate).

The next three items appear to apply directly to the process of rapping. The persons help each other (P19), they have high affect (A17), and they try to see how to think about the problem (A8).

The next four items may apply both to the arousal situation (process problems) and to the rapping transaction. Thus A2 is challenge and confrontation in the one and stimulation and reality - testing in the other. Time is more likely to pass quickly (A23) during rapping. Ideological-societal issues (L22) may reinforce the process problems--or contribute content to the rap session. Meeting task requirements (L12) may involve demands difficult enough to engender process problems; or it may be the form in which the group disciplines itself to try to handle process problems; or it may describe the cognitive strategy during rapping.

The remaining item is the negative of "we decided what we wanted to do and we did it." This suggests that the dynamic is reactive rather than active; that is, the process problems emerge from hidden agendas and what follows us largely in the emotional modes of "pairing" and acting out.

This dynamic portrays the operation of friendship as an ameliorative informal helping relationship. It is a small officially unrecognized part of the total operation of classes; and the 15 per cent of the variance it accounts for seems about understandable.

The function is highest in the academic college preparatory school with its middle class, ambitious, and competitive personnel. Process problems strongly interfere with one's ability to compete effectively, and stresses are high. Next in order, and placed similarly, are the two poor Black schools. Both are important agents of mobility; the one through academic learning and the other through preparation for a trade. In these classes students need to achieve a new perspective on "problems that occur regularly in other groups." Next in order is the open interest-oriented school which is partly set up to avoid the usual classroom problems and is highly sensitive to that aim. Finally comes the community school whose "process problems" are generally swept under the rug or accepted as an inevitable part of classroom operation: something to be lived through rather than dealt with even informally.

Discriminant Function #1, Student Ideals

This function accounts for 73.31 per cent of the variance in the ideal; and it is significant at the .0001 level or better. It portrays the major ideological issue in education as the students see it, and the differences among student bodies are differences in the balance they strike between the claims of the two sides of the issue. In brief, one side values a smooth, continuous, non-problematic, non-episodic flux of cognitive learning experiences; the other side values a more dramatic, episodic, problem-oriented dialogic process addressed to given tasks and problems. This latter has many Deweyian elements but falls far short of the Deweyian ideal because the problems and tasks are presented as demands from the "outside" rather than being authenticated by the group's experience.

Table 19 displays the item contents.

Table 19. Items for SI Discriminant Function #1

Standard Coefficient	Item No.	Abridged Content
.39	L12	Understanding and meeting task requirements
.32	A9	Feeling like rapping outside of class
.32	P15	Facing and solving problems
.31	L16	Process problems typical of other groups
.25	A2	Interpersonal challenge
.19	P19	Helping each other
.17	A13	Clarify personal experiences
.17	L21	Guidance from shared purposes
- - -	- - -	- - - - - - - - - - - -
-.28	A24	Feel like contributing to activity
-.24	A23	Time passes quickly for me
-.21	P10	One thing flowed from another
-.17	A11	Could be the sort of person I wanted to be
-.16	L7	Concentrate on significant aspects
-.15	A8	Think new thoughts of my own

The top group of items starts with task requirements to be met (L12). Students are personally involved and use friendship as an informal means to deal with stress (A9). They have a strong sense of problem (P15) and recognize the universality of their own problems of operation (L16)--that is, they sense the larger social context of their classroom work. They stimulate and challenge each other (A2) and they also support each other (P19). The experience is personally meaningful (A13) and individual efforts are legitimated partly by shared purposes of the group (L11).

/If this were the full Deweyian dialectic, the order of the items would tend to be reversed and the list would also include P18, capitalizing on diverse backgrounds, and P20, individual special skills contribute to group productivity. But such a pattern is ruled out by the education-defining assumptions of the general culture/.

This pattern may well represent the students' wish for a multi-dimensional classroom in which they can be fully-functioning "as an individual."

Opposed to this pattern is the second group of items; and the two groups tend, in pure form, to be mutually exclusive.

The second pattern starts with the ideal of students motivated to participate (A24). They are absorbed in the activity (A23) and the sequence of activities flows smoothly without disjunction (P10). The student role is comfortable and the student is satisfied with it (A11). There is strong (and accepted) focussing by the teacher (L7), and a pleasurable sense of stimulation of personal ideas (A8).

This would seem to fit the students' ideals, analyzed earlier, of avoidance of personal threat and the teachers' ideals of a trouble-free classroom undisturbed by real-life social and societal problems.

This function separates the schools into two groups. The two Black inner city schools are higher on the first pattern; the three middle class white schools--even the "open" one--are closely bunched with much greater emphasis on the second pattern. [Here, in these ideologies, is the clearest evidence of social-economic-class differences. The bland, traditional, certification-oriented middle class operation simply doesn't fit the culture of poor people. What results is an image of confronting demands whose difficulty mobilizes (in the ideal) the classroom into a partially realized community. But these aspects of community tend at most to be tolerated as "adjustment mechanisms" rather than being capitalized on to develop a genuine group-and-individual inquiring way of life. For the most part, we simply do not know how to take this next step--to use our experience with poor students as a basis for insights capable of improving education for all].

Discriminant Function #2, Students Ideals

This function accounts for 13.87 per cent of the variance in the ideal data; and it is significant at the level of .0041 or better. Its composition is shown in Table 20.

Table 20 - Items for SI Discriminant Function #2

Standard Coefficient	Item No.	Abridged Content
.43	A2	Interpersonal challenge
.42	A13	Clarification of previous personal experience
.36	L4	Group has reasons for activity
.27	P10	One thing flowed from another
.27	P18	Group aided by diversity of individual backgrounds
-.39	A8	Think new thoughts of my own
-.28	A9	Feel like rapping outside of class
-.26	L21	Group purposes guide behavior
-.25	A23	Time passed quickly for me
-.24	P3	We accomplished a great deal
-.22	L7	We concentrated our activity on significant aspects of task.

These patterns both apply to a group engaged in ongoing activity. The distinction is between two ways in which the individual uses his participation in the activity. The first group of items suggests private quests within the group which is experienced as a sort of therapeutic milieu. The second group of items suggests a high level of personal involvement as a member of a group seeking to achieve its own purposes. In more detail:

In the first pattern,"individuals are challenged by what others say" (A2). The challenge presumably comes from their "different individual backgrounds" (P18). The challenging dialogue results in clarification of one's past experience (A13). The dialogue is kept under control by the rule of reason (L4) and the smooth continuity-producing management of the group (P10). [This could represent the model of "milieu therapy," in which the individual is helped to resolve personal ambiguities by watching and participating in debate between individuals who are able to express in pure or direct form the two sides of his ambivalence].

The second pattern first comments on the experience of the individual and then on the conditions under which this experience occurs. His experience, then, is of thinking new thoughts (A8), of being personally involved to the extent of wanting to rap (A9), and of feeling immersed or absorbed in something (A23). This something turns out to be the work of a successful accomplishment-oriented class (P3) which has a strong sense of shared purpose (L21) and which focusses its effort effectively (L7).

Thus the distinction is, in a sense, between the individual as engaged interactively in a personal private quest versus the individual as an effective fully functioning member of a purposive group.

Not surprisingly, the general school which ranks actual function #2 highest also ranks this ideal pattern highest. It is as if it aims for individual clarification and winds up with interpersonal attack. At the other extreme is the inner city trade school which was highest on the first actual function and is also highest on the second pattern above. There seems to be a clear relationship between idealization of the "involved" member of a purposive group and the actual realization of an individual utilizing social interactive process to meet confronting problems and tasks. The three middle class schools are bunched in the middle, presumably reflecting a more even balance between the two ideal patterns.

Summary

The discriminant analysis has described three coherent actual modes of operation and two ideological issues. In brief, the actual modes are:

1. The class is confronted with tasks and exercises. The members meet these demands through interactive support and stimulation, and comfort by their peers.

2. The class is involved in personal-social-ideological conflict which it maintains through interpersonal attack. Individuals find satisfaction in their roles and feel that the "dialogue" is personally meaningful.

3. The class has process problems (which it is familiar with) and it deals with them through operation of the informal friendship structure.

With equel brevity, the ideological issues are:

1. Traditional, bland, trouble-free safe discussion versus dramatic, episodic, multi-dimensional activities in which one lives "as a person."
2. Individual private quest within the group as therapeutic milieu versus highly involved effective participant in purposive group effort.

A cursory comparison of the locations of the five schools with respect to these functions made a good deal of sense from our general understanding of the five schools. We shall carry the analysis further in the next report on the full range of similarities and differences among schools.

Chapter 8 - Educational Opportunity: Satisfaction

Classrooms make demands on students. Over time, students learn to cope with these demands with varying degrees of success. The successful ones tend to think the environment is pretty good; the unsuccessful ones are more likely to think that the environment is at least partly to blame for their failure. It seems reasonable, therefore, to suppose that successful students are more likely than unsuccessful students to perceive that their actual classroom resembles their ideal classroom.

In these statements, "success" is sensed by the student: he feels adequate and, by his lights, is getting along fine. But, while we are glad for his apparent sense of well-being, we are not about to assume that being successful in this sense can necessarily be equated to "getting educated." The sense of well being does not connote anything about the quality of his educational opportunity; what it does imply is that he may be better able to take advantage of whatever opportunity exists. But we need some other way to find out how educative the opportunity is.

"Educativeness" is a judgment that someone makes on some basis. In the previous chapters we have tried to draw a portrait of what classrooms are like; and every reader has, I am sure, formed his own opinion as to how "educative" such classrooms are. Such evaluations are based on the judge's theories and definitions; and they compare classrooms against some possibly long-range ideal--which, being ideal, by definition cannot exist under present circumstances. Our interest however is descriptive, not evaluative. We want to know if satisfied students see the educative aspects of the classroom--whatever they may be--as more prominent than they seem to dissatisfied students. To find out what the "educative aspects" are we shall call on the people responsible for keeping them alive and well and living in the classroom: the teachers.

We assume that teachers are, on the whole, more satisfied with educative rather than with non-educative classrooms. It is probably true that each teacher has certain individual needs whose expression only indirectly facilitates his educational mission, and that some of the requirements in every classroom probably cannot be justified on educational grounds. On the other hand, features emphasized and implemented by most or all teachers are quite likely to be connected to their common wisdom about education. Therefore we shall assume that the pattern of features associated with teacher satisfaction will correspond to the educational opportunities of their students. And that if students perceive these features as characteristic of the actual class, then the classroom does offer these educational opportunities to them. If, in addition, the students are themselves satisfied with these features then they are more likely to take advantage of them. And these, then, would be the students that school is really "for."

Our data will show that the more satisfied the student the more likely he is to value the same features of actual classes that teachers are satisfied with; and also the more likely he is to describe his ideal classroom the way teachers describe their ideal classrooms. It seems to us that satisfied students, therefore, tend to have whatever educative opportunity the schools provide, and are also most likely to make the most of it. Such deeper questions as to whether the underlying processes have the quality of spontaneous growth or of identification with captors for survival in a concentration camp cannot be answered directly from our data; although the earlier description of the general cultural "givens" suggests that if the rhetoric of captivity and survival is to be employed, then both teachers and students are captive to the institutional society.

In this chapter, then, we ask who are the students who are "satisfied," how similar are their perceptions to those of their teachers, what is the educational opportunity the schools provide for them, how do the teachers see the educational opportunity, and what basic orientations differentiate satisfied from dissatisfied students. We shall consider these questions in the order of their listing and will conclude with a few comments on implications.

Characteristics of Satisfied Students

Satisfaction is indexed by the correlation (Spearman) of actual and ideal patterns of the respondent. The higher the coefficient, the more satisfied the student is taken to be. Within each school we have collected data on achievement tests, reading tests, age, sex, socio-economic status, grade-point average, rank or "standing" in class (grade), and teacher judgments of "how much the student is getting out of class." The correlations of all these variables with satisfaction were computed separately for each of the five schools. Table 21 shows the significance level of all the correlations at the .10 level or better. All the correlations are positive except those involving age and grade in school.

Achievement Tests

Among the five schools we have 11 achievement and reading tests.

Of the 11, one in each of three schools is correlated significantly with satisfaction: the Comprehensive Achievement Battery in the traditional community school, the Metropolitan Numerical (but not verbal) score in the inner city trade school, and one reading test, the Davis, given to only a few students in the inner city general school (In advance of detailed school-by-school analyses it seems likely that these three tests index something fairly central to the accommodations of students within the differing circumstances of the three schools.

Table 21 - Student Characteristics Significantly Correlated with Satisfaction

(Levels of Significance less than .10)

	Community	Trade	General	Academic	Interest	No. Cases
Standard Tests	Comp. Ach.	Numer. Metro	Davis			
	+.014	+.097	+.034			3
Grade Point Average		+.063			+.003	2
Class Percentile Rank	+.014	+.041			+.001	3
"Success" Rank				+.032	+.080	2
Age	-.063	-.053			-.087	3
Sex					+.015	1
Grade					-.001	1
Socio-econ. Status	--	--	--	--	--	0

We conclude that there is no across-the-board relationship between satisfaction and "achievement" as measured by standard tests.

Grade Point Average

Grade Point Average correlates significantly with satisfaction in two of the five schools: the trade school and the interest-oriented school. These are the two schools in which students are expected to take the most initiative; and it may be that grade point average serves as an index of adequacy and "thrust."

Class Percentile Rank

Class Percentile Rank indexes the student's "standing" in his class; and in three schools it is significantly related to satisfaction: the traditional community school, the trade school, and the interest-oriented school. The measure is not easy to interpret with much confidence because different students are "weighted" differently--according to local policies--in the calculation of class percentile rank.

We can see, however, that the variable is significant in both schools for which grade point average is significant; and for two of the three schools in which at least one standard test is significant. In the college preparatory school, none of the above three achievement measures is significantly related to satisfaction and in the inner city general school, only the Davis test, based on an inadequate sample, is related to satisfaction.

Summing up, achievement is a factor in satisfaction in the trade school; it enters less strenuously in the community school and in the interest-oriented school; and it is of little or no consequence to satisfaction in the academic college prep school and the inner city general school.

"Success" Rank

Teachers were asked to rank each student with respect to "how much this student seems to get out of his classroom experience." The variable is significantly related to satisfaction in the academic college preparatory school and in the interest-oriented school. These happen to be the schools in which one would suppose the judgment would be easiest to make because of the clear and rigorous standards of the one school and the action-orientation of the other.

Age

Age is negatively correlated to satisfaction in the three schools in which achievement is related to satisfaction. In these schools, the younger the student the more satisfied he is likely to be. (Age is also, not surprisingly, negatively correlated to achievement).

Sex

Girls tend to be more satisfied in the interest-oriented school. Otherwise sex is not significantly related to satisfaction.

Socio-Economic Status

Socio-economic status, assessed from information about the occupation of parents, is not significantly correlated with satisfaction in any of the five schools.

Classroom Versus School "Cultures"

We have just seen that the relationships between satisfaction and the various demographic variables are quite weak. Are we to conclude that the institutional culture of the school has only a small influence on which variables will enter into satisfaction? Consider, for example, socio-economic status. Are we to believe that the socio-economic status of the child's family makes no difference to his satisfaction and to his educational opportunities in any school? Certainly not! But if we are going to dispute our findings about SES we might as well have at the others. So let us re-examine the procedures of our inquiry, beginning with the data from students.

It will be recalled that each student described one actual class; and that ten actual classes in each school were involved. In addition, each student described his ideal class. And satisfaction for each student was determined by correlating his perceptions of his actual class with his perceptions of his ideal class. Thus we have ten sub-populations of satisfaction scores, one for each of ten classes. To the extent that the classes are different from each other, the variables correlated with satisfaction in one class may be quite different from those correlated with satisfaction in another class. And when we throw these ten different sub-populations together into one school population, the relationships that differ across classrooms will tend to cancel each other out.

In short, for a relationship to show up for the school, it has to be one which is reasonably similar in the various classrooms. A "school" relationship, then, is actually a relationship common to a preponderance of the classes in which a relationship exists.

Thus what we have found out is that all the classrooms are not biased the same way when it comes to the relationship between socio-economic-status and satisfaction. But it would be a great mistake to conclude that socio-economic status (or any other variable) is therefore not related to satisfaction (or to educational opportunity). All we have seen is that it is not related the same way (or one preponderant way) in the ten classes.

Let us examine this proposition further, by looking at the relationships between socio-economic status (as an example) in the fifty classes.

Of the fifty classes, 12 showed significant correlations between socio-economic status and satisfaction. Of the 12, half the correlations were positive and the other half negative. There was a strong tendency for the mean satisfaction in the class to be high (median rank 2.5 out of 10) when the correlation was negative; and to be low (median rank 8 out of 10) when the correlation was positive. The actual level of socio-economic status in the 12 classrooms was not related directly either to satisfaction or to the correlation between satisfaction and SES. From one to four of the 12 classes were located in each of the five schools.

In brief, SES relates to satisfaction in one-quarter of the classes. When lower status children are more satisfied, average satisfaction in the class is high. When upper status children are more satisfied, the average level of satisfaction in the class is low. The average level of socio-economic status in the class is not directly related to level of satisfaction.

We have no doubt that what we have just discovered about socio-economic status will be true of the other variables: that the common bias of the school (if any) probably covers up very much sharper but different relationships among classes. (The study of the fifty classes will be undertaken in a succeeding monograph).

[We note parenthetically that we might have found stronger relationships in the school if we had asked students to describe their "general impression of what classrooms in this school are like" rather than ten particular and different classrooms].

The presumption that relationships differ markedly from one classroom to the next challenges us to try to explain how this comes about. Is there some common mechanism through which differences in classroom operation get translated into corresponding differences in the influence of demographic variables? Since the teacher has most to do with the nature of the classroom operation, it seems reasonable to suppose that something in the relationships between students and teachers may be involved. For example, regardless of classrooms, would satisfied students tend to identify more strongly than dissatisfied students with the teacher? In that case, we could understand that girls identify better with one teacher and boys with another--and similarly with the other demographic variables. And might the salience of identification be a genuine school or population-cultural variable?

We do not have data on identification per se. But we do have ways of treating our data to get at some perceptual components of identification, and it is to these variables that we now turn.

Perceptual Similarities between Students and Teachers

We devised four variables to test the notion that certain perceptual components of teacher-student "identification" may correlate most directly with "satisfaction" and mediate the relationships between satisfaction and other characteristics of students in the different classrooms. These variables enable us to clarify further the distinction between a common school bias and separate and different classroom biases.

The first variable (TI-SI) is the correlation of each student's ideal pattern with his teacher's ideal pattern. The second variable (CTI-SI) is the correlation of each student's ideal pattern with the average of the ideal patterns of all ten teachers in his school. The third variable, TA-SA, and the fourth variable, TCA-SA, are the corresponding variables for the data on actual classrooms. All four of these variables were correlated with the student's score for satisfaction, and the results are displayed in Table 22. The table shows that all four variables correlate as strongly or stronger with satisfaction than do achievement and demographic variables. Further examination reveals a very interesting and unanticipated distinction between classroom and school cultures.

TI-SI Similarity between Ideals of Students and their Own Teachers.

The more congruent student's ideals are with the ideals of their own teacher, the more satisfied the students are. The significance levels are strong, ranging from .001 to .034 across four schools. The relationship is insignificant only in the academic college preparatory school.

The most salient variable in satisfaction is ideological similarity between teachers and student; and the students who "identify" may be boys or girls, low or high status (etc.) in the different classes.

TCI-SI Similarity between Ideals of Students and their (Combined) Faculty

The more congruent student's ideals are with the mean profile of faculty ideals, the more satisfied the student tends to be. But this relationship is weaker than the preceding one, indicating that ideological

Table 22 - Student Satisfaction vs. Perceptual Similarities with Teachers

(Levels of Significance)

	Community	Trade	General	Academic	Interest	No. Cases
TI-SI	+.001	+.034	+.013	--	+.001	4
TCI-SI	+.061	--	+.019	--	+.074	3
TA-SA	--	+.040	-.057	+.013	+.004	4
TCA-SA	--	+.008	--	+.001	+.001	3

"fit" between the student and his own teacher is more important to his well-being than is his "fit" with the "average" ideology of the faculty. That is, when it comes to values or ideals, the cultural congruence in the particular classroom is more significant than congruence with the school as an institution. And in two schools, the trade school and the academic college preparatory school, congruence with faculty ideals is insignificant.

TA-SA Similarity between "Actuals" of Students and their Own Teachers

In three schools, the trade school, college prep school and interest-oriented school, the more the student perceives his actual class the same way his teacher does, the more satisfied he is likely to be. In the inner city general school, the correlation is negative; and in the community school it is insignificant. In general one would suppose that similar perceptions of how the class operates would facilitate cooperation and communication. The negative finding in the inner city general school seems to suggest that the most satisfied students (or their teachers?) also have the most unrealistic view of how their classes operate. This calls for deeper analysis!

TCA-SA Similarity between "Actuals" of Students and their Combined Faculty

The findings are striking. The relationship is significant in the same three schools for which TA-SA was significantly related to satisfaction. But the relationships are also stronger for the combined faculty than for each teacher by himself. In short, agreement of the student with the average expectations of the faculty is connected more closely to his satisfaction in a particular class than is his agreement with the expectations of the teacher in that particular class. Thus it appears that in relation to satisfaction, the student's acceptance and agreement with general (or average) institutional expectations is more significant than is his agreement with his particular teacher's way of viewing the class.

Of the four kinds of perceptual similarity between teachers and students, identification with the teacher's ideology in the classroom is most intimately connected with student satisfaction, that is with the student's sense of similarity between his actual and ideal classrooms. His agreement with the "average" ideology of the faculty is less strongly related to his satisfaction. On the other hand, the student tends to be more satisfied when he perceives his actual class to be similar to the composite view ten teachers have of their own classes than when he perceives the actual class the way his own teacher does. It appears that the more satisfied the student is the more he perceives each of his own classes as being a variant of a school-wide general image of classes and the more he distinguishes among the ideologies of his particular teachers. And that the clearest differences among schools are with respect to how strongly these kinds of perceptual congruences are related to satisfaction of students. That is, the differences are in the extent that identification of students with teacher's matters.

The pattern of the four perceptual-similarity or "identification" variables is different among the five schools. All four variables are significant in the school oriented to students interests. In the trade school, satisfaction is related to both actual congruences and also to one ideal congruence. In the academic college preparatory school, both actual congruences are important but neither ideological congruence is. In the inner city general school satisfaction is related to both ideal congruences and is significantly negatively related to actual perceptual agreement with the teacher. And finally in the community school, both ideological congruences are significant while neither actual congruence is -the opposite of the academic college preparatory school.

These patterns are explicable and fit with one's impressions of the schools. In the more open interest-oriented school activities are developed through negotiation between student and teacher, and the student's autonomy in the situation will depend on his acceptance of expectations and his identification with the teachers ideology. In the academic college preparatory school, the activities are presumably determined by the requirements of subjects and the teacher's expectations of behavior are important but the teacher's personal ideology is irrelevant. In the trade school, expectations for performance are salient and also the sympathetic encouragement of the teacher (which is presumably related to identification in common ideals). In the community school, the expectations are given realities that are obvious to both satisfied and dissatisfied students. Satisfaction, then, depends on how one accepts these realities and that in turn is strongly mediated by identification with the teacher. Finally, in the inner city general school, there is considerable conflict between interpersonal relations and work as the means to survival; and there is little doubt that the students who "make it" are the ones who have close relationships with at least one sympathetic teacher. Thus the ideological congruence is significantly positive. The actual congruence is significantly negative because the teachers see the class as a place in which learning activities are carried out whereas the students perceive it more as a milieu for interpersonal relationships.

The Nature of the Educational Opportunity in Schools

Regardless of who the satisfied students are, their perceptions combine to give a quite coherent view of their classes. In this section we shall analyze and present this view.

Our data treatment in this section was for the purpose of identifying the ALP actual and ideal items that accompany satisfaction. That is, the more satisfied the student, the more likely he is to regard these particular items as characteristic of his actual or ideal class. These items were identified by correlating the students' rankings of each item with their scores for satisfaction.

The data for actual and ideal items are shown in Tables 23 and 24 respectively. The tables show the 24 items and the five schools. The cells show the level of significance of the Pearson correlation between each item and "satisfaction"(which was defined as the Spearman correlation between ideal and actual patterns of each student). Significance levels between .05 and .10 are shown in parentheses. The marginal columns show in how many schools the correlation for the item was significantly positive or negative; the marginal rows tell how many items correlated significantly positively and negatively with satisfaction in each school.

These marginal numbers give us a quick fix on the shape of the data. The number of items correlated positively or negatively with satisfaction ranges from 9 to 16 in the five schools, with an average of 12 for the actuals and 10.6 for the ideals. Of the actual items, one (L22, negative) turns out to be significant in all five schools; another, (P3, positive)

Table 23

ALP "ACTUAL" Correlates with Satisfaction, SA SI

(Levels of Significance)

	Community	Inner City Trade	Inner City General	Academic College Prep.	Interest-Oriented	Number of Schools +	Number of Schools -
A2							
A8			-.034				1
A9			(-.059)		+.027	1	1
A11		(-.101)	-.006	+.001		2	1
A13		(-.093)		-.001	-.027		3
A17	+.010			+.001	+.013	3	
A23	(+.099)		-.008	+.001	(+.066)	3	1
A24	+.008			+.001		2	
L4	-.020			-.008	-.005		3
L6			+.008	-.038	+.014	2	1
L7					-.043		1
L12		+.023			-.002	1	1
L14	+.040	(+.054)				2	
L16	-.001			-.001	-.001		3
L21	-.029			-.052			2
L22	-.002	-.025	(-.073)	-.001	-.013		5
P1	(-.086)		+.015			1	1
P3	+.001		+.023	+.001	+.001	4	
P5					(-.068)		1
P10		(-.087)	-.003		+.017	1	2
P15	(+.096)	+.001			+.024	3	
P18	-.009			-.001	(-.065)		3
P19	(+.100)		+.001			2	
P20		+.029	+.012		+.049	3	
Σ+	7+	4+	5+	5+	8+		
Σ-	6-	4-	6-	7-	8-		
Total	13	8	11	12	16		

Table 24

ALP "IDEAL" Correlates with Satisfaction, SA-SI

(Levels of Significance)

	Community	Inner City Trade	Inner City General	Academic College Prep.	Interest-Oriented	Number of Schools +	Number of Schools -
A2			+.002		-.003	1	1
A8		(+.058)		(+.056)		2	
A9	-.008	-.008					2
A11	(-.085)		-.048		-.005		3
A13		-.007			-.048		2
A17	-.002	-.004		-.001	-.023		4
A23	-.002	-.012					2
A24						-	
L4						-	
L6						-	
L7	+.005	(+.066)				2	
L12	+.004	(+.097)				2	
L14	+.017	(+.100)		(+.069)		3	
L16			-.041	+.001		1	1
L21			-.047	-.004	-.024		3
L22	-.034		(-.079)	(+.051)	-.027	1	3
P1						-	
P3		+.033		(-.090)	+.056	2	1
P5		+.002	+.017	+.014	+.041	4	
P10	+.001			+.024	+.018	3	
P15	+.014	+.003			(+.052)	3	
P18			-.031	(-.052)			2
P19	-.044		+.038		+.001	2	1
P20	-.039						1
Σ +	5+	7+	3+	6+	5+		
Σ -	7-	5-	5-	4-	6-		
Total	12	12	8	10	11		

has the same sign in four schools. Seven additional items are significant in three schools. The remaining 15 items, except A2, are significant in one or two schools. Seven items are correlated oppositely among the schools indicating, one supposes, differences in local operations.

For the ideal items, two show significant correlations of the same sign in four schools (A17, negative, and P5, positive). Six items are significant in three schools. Four items show no significant correlations and five items show mixed correlations.

Our strategy of interpretation begins by grouping the items according to the number of schools for which they are significant. Table 25 displays the groupings for the Actual and Table 26 for the Ideal correlates with satisfaction. For purposes of interpretation, Groups A, B, C, and D will be discussed. Groups A and D show the strongest relationships, positive and negative, with satisfaction. Groups B and C show weaker relationships. The themes they point too should, one hopes, be supportive of the major themes of Groups A and D. In order of analysis, we shall consider the groups in the order of A, D, B, and C--beginning with the Actuals.

Relationships between Satisfaction and Perceptions of Actual Classes

Group A. The more satisfied the student, the more characteristic of the class he thinks the items in this group are. The generalizations hold for three of the five schools on four items and for four of the schools on the fifth item. Two of the items, P15 and P3 are generally viewed as characteristic; P20 is rated 16th; and A17 and A23 are generally uncharacteristic.

Table 25. Actual Items Correlated with Satisfaction

	Preponderantly Positive				Preponderantly Negative		
	Item No.	No. Schools	Mean in Composite		Item No.	No. Schools	Mean in Composite
	P3 *	+4	7		A8	-1	4
	P15	+3	2		P5	-1	5
A	P20	+3	16		L7	-1	10
	A17 *	+3	24		--	--	--
	A23 *	+3, -1	18		P10	-2, +1	8
	--	---	--	C	A11	-2, +1	15
	L14	+2	1		L21	-2	22.5
B	A24	+2	3		--	--	--
	P19	+2	9		L4 *	-3	11
	L6	+2, -1	14		L16 *	-3	12
	--	----	--	D	A13	-3	21
	L12	+1, -1	6		P18 *	-3	22.5
	P1	+1, -1	13				
	A9	+1, -1	20		L22 *	-5	19

Table 26. Ideal Items Correlated with Satisfaction

	Preponderantly Positive				Preponderantly Negative		
	Item No.	No. Schools	Mean in Composite		Item No.	No. Schools	Mean in Composite
	P5	+4	12		P20	-1	8
	L14	+3	4		--	--	--
A	P15	+3	7		A23	-2	11
	P10	+3	13		A9	-2	20
	--	----	---	C	A13	-2	21
	A8	+2	5		P18	-2	22
	L12	+2	10		--	--	--
B	L7	+2	17		L22	-3, +1	24
	P3	+2, -1	1		A11	-3	14
	P19	+2, -1	2	D	L21	-3	19
	--	--	--		A17	-4	9
	A2	+1, -1	18				
	L16	+1, -1	23				

The satisfied students perceive as more characteristic that they face and solve problems (P15); and that they accomplish a great deal (P3). They are more aware of individual special skills helping the group (P20); and they tend to feel more absorbed (A23) in the work and also more excited (A17) by what "happens." In the context of these five items, P15 and P3 suggest meaningful work; P20 suggests individual effectiveness; A23 suggests immersion in work; and A17 indicate affect and adventure.

Group D. One would expect that the items seen as less characteristic by the satisfied students would suggest obstacles or barriers to the sort of work effectiveness identified in Group A. Thus they see the class as less "troubled" by issues of the "larger society" (L22)--the only item chosen by all five schools. They see less of process problems characteristic of "other groups" (L16); and they see less of the "group" having reasons for its activity (L4)--which, in this context seems to be regarded as a constraint on individual effectiveness (possibly because "group" reasons may really mean "teacher reasons"). A13 and P18, generally seen as uncharacteristic of classrooms, are even more down-graded by the satisfied students. A13's clarification of previous personal experiences and P18's capitalization on diversity of individual backgrounds both imply problems emerging from the self or from the deeper conflicts among persons; and both may be seen by students as threatening. Thus we suggest that the "meaningful" problems that represent accomplishment in Group A are probably public or objectively definable, possibly "given" or imposed problems rather than private self-related problems. And both P20 and A23 in Group A would be much more likely to go with the former than the latter kind of problems.

Group B. Turning now to the items less strongly related to satisfaction, we note Group B is highly supportive of Group A. In short, the individually-work-effective students tend more than others to believe they learn useful things (L14). They also see the class as more motivated to "contribute" (A24), as more helpful to each other (P19) and as tending more at times to have "good group process." In short, these latter three items of Group B very well characterize a gung-ho, supportive, trouble-free milieu.

Group C. Similarly, Group C should echo and support group D at a somewhat lower level of relationship to dissatisfaction. The lesser awareness of L21, guidance by group purposes, seems to go along with the lesser awareness of group reasons in Group D. The lesser awareness of being the sort of person I want to be, A11, seems to go along with the lesser awareness of clarifying personal problems (A13). P10, however, is more readily assimilated to Group A: P20 and P15 speak of problem solving to which individuals contribute skills; and this sort of experience is dramatic (A17) and episodic. Under such conditions, P10, one thing flowed from another--implying a smooth sequence or continuity--would certainly seem less characteristic.

The General Pattern: Summary "Actual"

In summary, as compared to dissatisfied students, the more satisfied people tend to see the actual class more as a place in which individuals work effectively on problems. People are more motivated, and more helpful; and the class is sufficiently orderly. The class is seen as less troubled by societal issues and process problems; it is less constrained by group purposes and reasons; and the work is safety removed from self-related threat and from hidden interpersonal conflict.

It is as if the satisfied people tend to like being confronted by things to sink their seeth in, they enjoy accomplishment, they want to accept each other as similarly interested; and they wish to avoid personal, social, and societal confrontations of all sorts.

Further Comments: School Differences

We note that on four items, one school runs counter to the other two or three. These and other school uniquenesses will be reserved for the discussion in the next report of the five schools. In anticipation, a glance at Table 23, along with other information about the five schools, makes the the exceptions seem reasonable. Thus in the academic college preparatory school, the more satisfied students upgrade rather than downgrade All; and for that school All probably should be interpreted as role-satisfaction. They also downgrade L6, implying less awareness of good group process and more awareness of being held to some model of middle class order and politeness. The reversed correlation of P10, one thing flowed from another, seems understandable in the open, more interest-oriented school in which, one supposes, the usual means for securing continuity are more muted or absent. Finally, the satisfied people in the inner city academic school tend to downgrade rather than upgrade "time passed quickly for me" and this would go along very well with the insignificant correlation (to satisfaction) of the elements of structured work: L7, L12, P5, and P15.

Without going into detailed examinations of the five schools, it is possible to state more precisely to what schools our generalizations best apply. The seven asterisked items apply to all three middle class white schools: the academic college prep school, the open interest-oriented school, and the traditional agricultural-oriented school. In two cases one or both the inner city schools go along; in one case one inner city school is opposite; and in four items, the correlation is insignificant for both inner city schools.

Relationships Between Satisfaction and Perceptions of Ideal Classes

Group A. The more satisfied the student, with his orientation in the *actual* class to work effectiveness, the more he *idealizes* learning useful things, L14; being given problems to solve, P15; having smooth continuity in the work, P10, and knowing how well he is doing, P5. In his ideal, then, there would be more direction and technical facilitation of the problem-solving activities.

Group D. The items the satisfied student wants to downgrade go along with this desire for safe, non-risky problem-processing. Thus he wants to be untroubled by societal issues (L22); to be unconstrained by group purposes or will (L21); and not have to accept responsibility for "being the kind of person I want to be" (A11). The extent to which he wants to be personally or self-*un*involved is shown dramatically in the downgrading of "being excited by what was happening" (A17). (This is all the more remarkable in view of the students as a whole wanting to upgrade A17 from 24th in the actual to 9th in the ideal).

Group B. The lesser relationships of Group B add confirmation to the desire for clear work-directions. L12 is understanding and meeting requirements of (presumably given) tasks. L7 is focus on significant aspects of tasks. A8 emphasizes the cognitive: thinking new thoughts of my own; P3 is accomplishing a great deal; and it is clear that accomplishment to the students who are satisfied means doing well on the exercises and activities set by the teacher. P19, helping each other, under these conditions, implies assistance in work.

Group C. The theme of group C seems to be uninvolved blandness. A23 is downgraded; the students don't want to lose themselves in work (--in which case time would pass quickly). A9, they don't want to rap with others outside class--meaning they don't care to get that personally involved; A13, clarifying personal private experience would be both too involving and too risky, as well as being opposed to safe happy occupation with "given" problems. P18, with its sense of hidden interpersonal conflict is likewise downgraded.

The General Pattern, Summary, "Ideals"

The more satisfied the student, the more he seeks to have clear-cut, focussed, tasks and problems set for him; the less he wants to be personally involved (emotionally) in the class; the less he seeks risk-taking adventure; and the more he seeks freedom from personal and societal confrontation.

Further Comments: School Differences

Three schools run counter to the trends of three items. In the academic college preparatory school, the more satisfied students tend to downgrade accomplishment, P3; and they tend to upgrade the class as being "troubled" by the issues of the larger society, L22. The satisfaction pattern of this school shows significant correlations to L16, problems that occur in other groups, and to A8, thinking new thoughts--as well as connections to the problems task-structure of L12, P15 and L7. The satisfied students in this school are oriented cognitively and, in the ideal, to understandings of social conditions which, in the general picture, are seen as threatening. As for the other exception, it occurs on P19, helping each other, which tends to be downgraded by the satisfied students in the traditional agriculture-community school. From the rest of the pattern for this school, shown on Table 2 , one wonders if "helping each other" is taken to mean cheating!

Comparison of Actual and Ideal Correlates of Satisfaction

In the above discussion there are nine items that correlate the same way (positively or negatively) with satisfaction in both actual and ideal classes. Three items correlate oppositely. Five items significant in the ideal are not included in actual groups A-D; and 4 significant actual items are not significant in the ideal. Table 27 tabulates actual and ideal groups A, B, C, D, and "other."

In Table 27 the items in the columns A & B and in the rows A & B are positively correlated with satisfaction. Similarly columns and rows C & D include the negative correlates.

The more satisfied the student, the more he tends to both see and want more of P15, problem-solving. In the ideal, problem-solving is assimilated to useful learning, L14; in the actual, it is assimilated more to accomplishment, P3. In both, helping each other is supportive. On the negative side, the satisfied people tend to both see and want less of L22, "troubled" by societal issues. In the ideal case, these troubles

Table 27 - Comparison of Actual and Ideal Correlates of Satisfaction

		Actual				
		A	B	C	D	Other
Ideal	A	P15	L14	P10		P5
	B	P3	P19			A8 L12 L7
	C	A23			P18 A13	A9
	D	A17		L21 A11	L22	
	Other		L6 A24		L16 L4	

are assimilated to group purposes (L21) and to individual role-satisfaction (A11); in the actual, the societal troubles are assimilated more to personal problems (A13) and to hidden conflicts (P18).

In the ideal, satisfied persons tend to accentuate the cognitive structural elements, knowledge of progress (P5), meeting task requirements (L12), focus on significant aspects (L7) and thinking new thoughts (A8).

In the actual, the satisfied persons tend to be more aware of the orderly group (L6) and the motivated member (A24).

In the ideal, satisfied persons downgrade rapping (A9). In the actual, satisfied persons tend to see less of group-process problems (L16), and of group reasons or rationale for activities (L4).

As to the contradictions, in the actual, satisfied students see a great deal more of excitement (A17) and somewhat more of absorption in work (A23); whereas in the ideal, they strongly downgrade excitement and somewhat downgrade absorption in work. Similarly, in the ideal they upgrade continuity (P10) whereas in the actual, they see less of it.

In summary, satisfied persons see and want meaningful, useful, productive, supportive problem solving. They see and want less societal and interpersonal conflict, less group constraint, and less personal involvement. In addition, in the ideal, the satisfied persons want more technical task-direction and less of the "good group member" whereas in the actual, they see more of the good group member and less of the technical task direction.

The Dissatisfied People

Looking at the same data from the other end, one sees that whereas the satisfied people are oriented to work effectiveness undistracted by personal-social problems and affect, the dissatisfied people are the opposite. But since all of our rhetoric has been from the standpoint of the satisfied person, let us see how the dissatisfied person might think about it.

In row CD, he is more aware that the class is troubled by issues in the larger society; and he thinks it should be. He also sees and places higher value on clarifying his own personal experience, on being the sort of person he would like to be, on capitalizing on inter-member diversity and on working within shared purposes. He does not perceive more rapping outside of the actual class but feels ideally there should be more. He would like more excitement and absorption in work and he sees less of these features than do the satisfieds. In row AB, the dissatisfied person sees and wants less accomplishment (as connected to problem solving), less "useful" learning (for other situations) and less helping each other (to meet work requirements). He also downgrades the rest of the technical achievement-oriented structure of the activities. He sees more and wants less continuity (imposed on the class). In his actual class, he is less aware of the "good member" (L6, A24) and is more aware of process problems and of group "reasons."

Teacher Satisfaction versus Student Satisfaction

Our warrant for thinking that the opportunities perceived by satisfied students tend also to be educative (as defined by the school) is that satisfied students tend to have ideals similar to those of their teachers, and, to a lesser extent, they also perceive the classroom the same way their teachers do. In addition to these findings, discussed above, we may now turn to the actual and ideal items that go along with teacher satisfaction; and the unexpected (at least by us) relationship between student ideals and teachers' actuals will make the case stronger than we expected it to be.

Satisfaction scores for the teachers, TATI, were calculated. The distribution of satisfaction scores for all 49 teachers were then correlated with their ALP ratings. The items significantly correlated with teacher satisfaction are displayed in Table 28. It should be noted that the correlates of teacher satisfaction are based on the entire combined faculty of the five schools, whereas the students' correlates were selected on the basis of numbers of schools for which the relationship was significant. Since the two procedures are not identical, the comparison with students suffers in exactness. But the findings do suffice to give a fairly strong impression.

There appears to be a close relationship between the students' and teachers' *actual* correlates with satisfaction, but that there is little or no relationship between teachers' and students' *ideal* correlates.

Table 28 shows five teacher *actual* items that correlate positively with teacher satisfaction. These same five items when applied to *ideal* classes, correlate significantly with student satisfaction. Similarly, the four *actual* items that correlate significantly negatively with teacher satisfaction also, when applied to *ideal* classrooms, correlate significantly negatively with student satisfaction. Thus the satisfaction correlates among the *teachers' actual* items correspond exactly with the satisfaction correlates among the *students' ideal* items. To put the matter crassly, whatever there is about the actual classroom that most satisfies the teacher is considered ideal by the students.

Continuing with the *actual* correlates of teacher satisfaction, we note that 6 of the nine items are also actual correlates of student satisfaction. Of the three exceptions, actual items P5 and A9 are not significant for student satisfaction. P10 is significant, but the sign is negative

Table 28 - Comparison of Teacher and Student Correlates of Satisfaction

	Teacher Actuals				Teacher Ideals			
			Comparison				Comparison	
	Items No.	Correl. (Sign.)	SA	SI	Items No.	Correl. (Sign.)	SA	SI
Positive Correlates with TATI	P15	+.019	+SA	+SI	A11	+.063	-SA	-SI
	P3	+.020	+SA	+SI	A23	+.080	+SA	-SI
	P19	+.021	+SA	+SI	A13	+.090	-SA	-SI
	P5	+.040	---	+SI				
	P10	+.086	-SA	+SI				
Negative Correlates with TATI	L22	-.002	-SA	-SI	L4	-.065	-SA	---
	P18	-.007	-SA	-SI	P20	-.092	---	---
	A9	-.020	---	-SI	L7	-.097	---	+SI
	A13	-.055	-SA	-SI				

rather than positive--even though in the students' ideal the sign is positive.

With regard to actual classrooms, satisfied teachers and satisfied students resemble each other quite closely. The more satisfied the teacher, the more he is aware of problem-solving, accomplishment, knowledge of progress, continuity, and helping each other; and this effective problem-solving pattern fits the ideal sought by the students. At the same time, the more satisfied the teacher, the less he perceives, in his actual classroom, troubles caused by societal issues, interpersonal "background" conflicts (and resources), rapping, and clarification of private personal experience. As with the students, the satisfied teachers see less of the personal-social-affective characteristics of the class.

Turning now to the ideal correlates of teacher satisfaction, we note that there are only six correlations, and they are only weakly significant, between .063 and .097. In four of the six items, the students' ideals are exactly opposite. And of the four TI correlates that are also SA correlates, two are similar in sign and the other two are opposite in sign. It is very clear that teacher satisfaction is much more associated with what happens in their actual classrooms than with what set of values they hold for their classes; and that their ideals tend to conflict with their actuals. Thus satisfied teachers tend to see less of A13 and want more; the less characteristic A13 actually is the more satisfied is the teacher; and yet the more satisfied the teacher the more he values A13. All seems to be tinged with the same sort of sentimentality: that teachers do feel that students should be able to clarify their experiences and that they should be able to live in class as the sort of persons they would like to be. As for A23, in their ideal class, satisfied teachers say that time would pass quickly; and satisfied students say that it *does* pass quickly--but that it shouldn't.

Finally, satisfied teachers downgrade three items in their ideal classroom. L4, group having good reasons for its activity, and L7, concentrating on significant task aspects, would at first glance seem to be part of the task structuring which students seek and which satisfied teachers see as prominent. But our data show that teachers feel these two characteristics are unsatisfactorily prominent. Both these items would be antithetical to A13 and (probably) to All as well in that each implies strong constraint on individual personal need meeting. It may be that the teachers feel that L4 and L7 imply more teacher domination than they think is appropriate either for meaningful individual problem-solving or for ideal personal need meeting. By and large satisfied students see too much *actual* domination by *group* "reasons" but in their ideal class they wish for even more focussing by the *teacher*.

Conclusions

Characteristics of Satisfied Students

Our demographic variables were correlated with satisfaction of students in ten classes in each school. The findings differed markedly from school to school. In one interest-oriented school, the more satisfied the student the more likely he is to have good marks, to be at the top of his class, be judged by teachers as getting a lot out of class, be female, younger, and in a lower grade. At the opposite extreme, in the inner city academic school, the only correlate is with one reading test; and in the academic college prep school, the only significant correlate is with teachers appraisal of "getting a lot out of class." In the trade school all three achievement assessments correlate positively and age correlates negatively with satisfaction. In the traditional school, the correlates are two achievement measures and (negatively) age. Socio-economic status is not significantly correlated with satisfaction in any school.

On the other hand, in anticipation of a subsequent report, we looked at the fifty classes separately with respect to socio-economic status and found six classes in which the lower the status the higher the satisfaction and six classes in which the higher the status the higher the satisfaction. We expect to find comparable diversity among classes with respect to the other variables. We conclude that the relationship between demographic characteristics and satisfaction (or opportunity) varies so much from class to class that generalizations about the school are pretty likely to be of dubious warrantability.

Nevertheless there are certain conditions, not associated with demographically pigeon-holed groups, that are school-wide and that correlate with satisfaction. These have to do with the general "climate" of student-teacher relationships as indexed by similarities of values (ideals) and expectations (actuals). In four of the five schools, the more satisfied the student the more likely it is that his pattern of values will be significantly correlated with his teacher's pattern of values. The correlation of his pattern with the mean profile of values of the ten teachers in his school is also significant but to a lesser degree and in three rather than four schools. If we think of the ALP ideals as standing for "culture," then the finding is that cultural congruence is significantly associated with satisfaction, regardless of ethnic, status, and other demographic designations.

Similarity of expectations (ALP actuals) held by teachers and students correlates significantly with satisfaction in three schools. Curiously, the composite description by the faculty of their ten different classrooms yields higher correlations than does the description by his own teacher of the class the student is in. It appears that the more satisfied the student the more likely he is to perceive his class as typical rather than unique or deviate.

We also compared the ALP items that correlate with teacher satisfaction with those that correlate with student satisfaction. There is much similarity between the two sets of items. The most striking finding is that the characteristics that are perceived most strongly by satisfied teachers as being true of their actual classrooms are identical with the items that satisfied students tend to use to characterize their ideal classrooms. What the teachers are satisfied with is what the students value. On the other hand, the few ideal items that correlate with teacher satisfactions tend to correlate negatively with student satisfaction. The teachers idealize some aspects of private self-related meanings that are not very prominent in their actual classes whereas the students, as noted, idealize actual features the teachers are satisfied with.

The Two Orientations

This brings us to the content of the actual and ideal patterns most characteristically noted by satisfied students and by dissatisfied students. The bulk of this chapter is devoted to the analysis of these patterns, in brief:

The satisfied students are oriented to accomplishment and objective problem-solving; and they wish the tasks could be more focussed and clear than they actually are. The dissatisfied students are more oriented to societal, social, and personal issues and problems and they seek even more personal involvement and affect. Basically the satisfied students regard personal-social dimensions as distracting and threatening; and as antithetical to effectiveness in coping with the curriculum; whereas the dissatisfied students see and want to deal with personal and social realities and tend to feel that the curriculum, whose activities are "given" in classrooms as something to cope with, may simply get in the way of what is really important.

The satisfied students are clearly the ones for whom most classrooms are designed. They accept the curriculum and will support most of the structuring acts of the teacher. The dissatisfied students downgrade the official pedagogical structure and intention of classes and want to deal with the human realities that exist and which they feel are ignored or suppressed.

Comments on the Two Orientations

Our findings reveal two conflicting or opposing orientations toward classrooms. One is the work-task-technological-impersonal-non-affective-asocial way of life that dominates classrooms and is strongly supported, if not dictated, by the dominant established cultural traditions with respect to "education." The other is the personal-affective-interactive-socially and societally aware-way of life which is regarded as irrelevant or inappropriate or bothersome in the traditional view of schools. The people who emphasize this position are, literally, dissatisfied. There is a third orientation for which we find little empirical evidence at the level of the school and that is the notion of the classroom as a dialectically oriented multi-dimensional, inquiring community. In theory--and so far only in theory--this orientation would be able to integrate the other two orientations within a larger view of the fully-functioning human life.

The first orientation, of students and teachers who are satisfied, is also the orientation of corporate effort--business, political, etc.--in society; and the students who learn to be satisfied in school are also probably going to be satisfied (and successful) in established social enterprises. Making the necessary adaptation to this orientation is really what the "hidden curriculum" is all about. Schools "select" the students who can master this hidden curriculum and point them toward established prestigious slots in the society; and they guide the failures into marginal lives of welfare, rip-offs, communal experiments doomed to collapse, and institutional confinement as wards of the state.

The second orientation is unpopular, non-viable, and mostly undeveloped in its implementing art and technology. Being the property of the dissatisfied, it tends to be reactive rather than having positive goals of its own. Efforts to cater to this orientation through sensitivity groups, some "open" classes, and various kinds of psychological remediation tend to lack human dignity and to smack of the anti-intellectual.

The third orientation has been experienced by most people in perhaps one or two classes during their entire educational careers, but compared to the other two orientations it calls for such sophistication or genius that its existence is mostly a happy accident and only a few theorists take it at all seriously as a model. And until they can show how to develop this way of life in the "ordinary" classroom, they have little chance to be heard except on ceremonial occasions like Commencement Day.

Chapter 9 - Educational Benefit: Achievement

Context of the Inquiry

Our various governments collect tax dollars and use them to run schools. They pass laws requiring children to attend these schools. They train and certify an army of persons to do to and for children whatever the schools were set up to accomplish. The school is a social organization, and the child's experiences in it during his plastic developmental years influence almost every dimension of his becoming. Although every child is changed in many ways, only a few of these changes are considered relevant to the purposes for which the school was set up. These relevant changes are assessed and called "achievement." Although "achievement" results from all of the child's experiences both in and out of school, the higher the achievement scores the more successful the school is considered to be. And the higher the achievement of a child, the more "successful" he is judged to be in school and the more additional benefits (jobs, college choice, status) will be conferred on him by the community.

Achievement is a serious matter quite apart from its salience in the educative maturation of individual children. The school whose achievement scores are judged to be too low calls into question the various motives that maintain the school: to create jobs and livelihood for teachers, to keep kids out of the labor market, to justify and expand the so-called educational "establishment," to make profits for publishers and builders, to help lower economic groups to a better life, and so on. What is measured and called achievement is the chief basis for the community's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with its schools. What it boils down to is that the child who achieves well makes the community happy and the child who achieves badly has to fight for even a modicum of acceptance; and he may even be punished through a variety of "remedial" services.

When educators--as distinguished from politicians, ethnic leaders, and social planners--reflect on this state of affairs, the issue that troubles them most is that of salience of achievement to education. The poles of the issue are: in the process of achieving, the child becomes a mature, self-realizing (etc., etc.) person versus in order to achieve, the child's character and self-realization are arrested or perverted. The genius of the dream (at least) of the comprehensive high school was in seeing that for different children different courses would facilitate self-realization; and in such courses, achievement would indeed be salient to education. Without going into all the difficulties of implementing the concept, we do note that high schools do offer many elective courses and to some extent help students select courses that make sense to the student's abilities and interests. Moreover, the standards, flavor, and climate of these offerings differs among schools, and at present, through such devices as vouchers, bussing, cluster-schools, and city-wide recruitment, election among schools is becoming available to increase the salience of achieving within different individual ways of life.

Clearly it is a good thing to help students find the courses and schools in which meeting official demands for achievement also meets personal needs.

But now another consideration enters, and that is that achievement can be judged high or low or average only against some norm. And that norm is always other students. In the classroom, high achievement means achieving better than most of the others in the room. On standardized achievement tests, high achievement means scores higher than most of a large national sample of grade-mates. In short, using elective classes and schools to make courses a little more educationally salient may make the demands for achievement a little more humane, but it does not necessarily reduce pressure of competition for grades. So another round of adjustments such as tracking and juggling of statistics on "rank in class" are introduced to make the competition "fair"--often at the price of pre-judging the student's future instead of helping him find or create it for himself.

Thus it is that efforts to make achievement more salient and more fair have still left unscathed the central fact that the system demands that there be differences in achievement; that some students have to achieve better than others; that the societal benefits to which school is the entree still must be unevenly distributed.

In order to accept this state of affairs, one would like to be sure that it is equitable: that it does not turn out that the higher achievers are consistently drawn from one set of social groups and the lower achievers from another. This is a very hot issue in our society and facts are needed. Therefore we will see what we can find out about it from our data. This question needs to be examined from the standpoint of schools in general, each school in particular, and each classroom in each school. In this report, we will examine only the first two of these three possibilities.

There is however another question of equity which is more subtle than that of discrimination among groups, and for which the criterion is far from clear. And that is the possibility that successful achievement competition involves some special ability or personality traits that may be unrelated to educational salience of courses. There are students, for example, that teachers rate as "getting a lot out of class" who are not high achievers in the class. And it is not uncommon in some courses to mark students merely as "pass" or "fail." Moreover, McClelland and others have studied "need-achievement" and made out something of a case for it--at least for boys. This invites the interesting proposition that if these are the people who are most capable of becoming good leaders of societal enterprises then they are the ones to whom the opportunities should be opened up. And that invites the counter proposition that if we want to set up a special course for training and assessing leadership, we should do so; and then remove the competitive aspect from the other courses.

In any case, it is worth finding out about, and so we shall look to see if high and low achievers experience school differently, as judged by their ALP actual and ideal protocols. Finally, on the hunch that there may be trade-offs between opportunities and benefits, we shall compare the patterns of the satisfied students with the patterns of the achieving students.

Characteristics of the Achieving Student

The source of our generalizations about the achieving student is correlations between achievement and demographic variables as measured for each student. A further description of the variables follows:

The Demographic Variables--At the time the students filled out the ALP instrument, they also reported their age (to the nearest half-year) and their sex. Information on the students' grade-levels and socioeconomic class (SES) were obtained from the office. In the case of socioeconomic class, the information provided was the occupation of the father. (cf. appendix C)

A measure of satisfaction was also obtained for each student by computing the correlation between his actual ALP and his ideal ALP responses. This index has been discussed previously in this report.

The Achievement Measures--All schools were asked to give the class ranks of as many students as possible. In each school this class rank is weighted by the school according to its local formula. This class rank was divided by the class number, multiplied by 100 and subtracted from 100 to give the Class Percent (CLPERCT).

Teachers were asked to rank in order those students "who got the most out of class." These ranks were then used as the basis for forming five groups in each class with one being the highest ranking.

No new standardized achievement tests were given. In all five schools, scores on such tests were taken from office records. These tests had been administered in the ninth grade as a part of a regular and on-going testing program. In some schools a reading test was also available. The schools and the tests used are listed below.

Table 29 - Achievement Tests in Each School

School	Standardized Tests Used
Trade, Academic, and General:	Differential Aptitude Tests Form L 1970 A. Verbal Reasoning B. Numerical Ability Metropolitan Achievement Test: Advanced Reading Test, Form AM
Community:	General Educational Development Test
Interest:	The American College Testing Program

Finally, the Grade Point Average was available for three schools: Trade, Interest, and Academic.

For as many students as possible, then, two major kinds of achievement measures were gathered: measures based on standardized test of cognitive ability and measures based on teacher assessment of performance in school. The latter includes the class rank, the grade point average, and the success rank. In the following table, those achievement measures that correlated significantly (p less than .10) with the demographic variables are displayed. The number of correlations between the measures of achievement and the demographic variables was then divided by the number of possible correlations to give a percentage of significant relationships. The number at the top of the columns gives the number of perceptual and cognitive measures available for each school.

Age vs. Achievement

In four of the five schools, the higher the achievement the younger

Table 30 - Student Characteristics Significantly Associated With Achievement

	Total #	3 ↔ 3	3 ↔ 3	1 ↔ 3	3 ↔ 2	1 ↔ 2	24
	School	Trade	Academic	Interest	General	Community	Composite
Characteristics	Age		CL- -17%	C- CL- G- -75%	V- CL- N- M- -80%	C- CL- -67%	0 -42%
	Ses	M+ G- +17% -17%	V+ CL+ N+ SR+ M+ C+ +100%	CL+ G+ +50%	SR- -20%	C+ +33%	+42% -9%
	Sex	V+ CL+ N+ SR+ G+ +83%	SR+ G+ +33%	-C CL- SR- -75%	N- -20%	C+ CL+ +67%	-38% -17%
	SASI	CL+ N+ G+ +50%	SR+ +17%	CL+ SR+ G+ +75%	0	C+ CL+ +67%	+41%

☐ = Total Number Possible for School

C = Combined Achievement

V = Verbal Achievement

N = Numerical Achievement

M = Metro Reading

CL = CLPERCT

SR = Success Ranking

G = Grade Point Average

the younger the student. This finding is in line with the general expectation that able students are frequently further along in school than their age cohort. The relationship is weakest in the Trade and Academic schools where standards are high and explicit; maturity may be more of a factor in achievement. In the remainder of the analysis it may be well to keep in mind that immaturity (relative) as well as high achievement are involved in the data.

SES vs. Achievement--In those schools where the population is preponderantly white and middle-class, socio-economic class tends to be a factor in achievement. This relationship is most strikingly clear in the Academic school. In the two schools that have populations that are Black and mostly from low socio-economic classes, this positive relationship between achievement and SES does not hold. This finding is consistent with other studies of Black lower-class students that have found indices of socio-economic class inconclusive. It should be noted, however, that the relationship between achievement and socio-economic class is sufficiently strong in the white, middle-class schools that in this study those students who tend to be high achievers will also tend to have a higher socio-economic class level.

Sex vs. Achievement--Where the standards of the schools are clear, and where these standards are more congruent with the expectations of females than with males, the former will do better. Such is the case here in the Trade, Community, and Academic schools. In the two schools where standards are more open to personal negotiation--the Interest and General schools--boys tend to do better.

Satisfaction vs. Achievement--Higher scores on the achievement measures tend to be associated with higher satisfaction scores. This relationship is slight in the Academic school in which the imposition of high standards might dampen this trend. In the general school, where standards tend to be amorphous, the relationship disappears altogether. It should also be noted that satisfaction has a stronger relationship in most schools with perceptual rather than with cognitive measures.

Summary by Schools

Looking at the summary chart vertically and focusing on the individual schools instead of the variables themselves, one can gain some insight into who has the greatest opportunity to achieve in each school.

Trade--Being female is important. Somewhat less important but still pertinent is being satisfied. Age is not a factor. SES is ambiguous and relatively unimportant.

Academic--The most important factor related to achievement is socio-economic status. Being female is also related to achievement. Less important is age--with a slight advantage going to those students who are younger for their grade levels. Being satisfied is down-played and correlates positively only with teachers' ratings of "who gets the most out of class."

Interest--Being younger, male, and more satisfied provide some of the conditions for achievement here. Somewhat less important except in relation to school achievement (class rank and grade point average) is socio-economic class. Higher SES students here do not do better on standardized tests, but they do get a greater share of rewards for performance.

General--Being younger seems to be the one characteristic most consistently associated with achievement. This would seem to speak to the problem of drop-outs in the school. Younger students for their grade level will do better on achievement tests and in class ranks. Satisfaction is not a condition of achievement at this school.

Community--At this school being on grade level at a younger age is important. Those most likely to achieve here will probably be females and slightly more satisfied with their classes.

Composite--Adding the achievement measures together, both perceptual and cognitive, for the five schools, the percentage of correlations between these measures and the other variables used falls between 38 and 42 per cent. When one also considers that for three of the variables there is also an opposite tendency, one can see that the relation of these variables to achievement is not hard and fast. All that we can conclude for our composite population, then, is that the conditions for achievement that hold most strongly are: lower age, greater satisfaction, and higher socioeconomic class. As far as sex is concerned, girls tend a little more often than boys, to be the higher achievers.

The Achievement Ethos

What light do the ALP items, correlated with achievement, throw on the possibility of an "achievement subculture"? Table 31 displays those items that are correlated five or more times (out of a possible 24 times) with achievement measures. The items are listed in order of their number of positive or negative relationships. In addition, the table includes the mean rankings of the items in the actual and ideal composite profiles of students.

The Actual-Positive Items

One is struck by the tendency of high achievers to accentuate the already high ranks accorded to items basic to common expectations of the student role. These items assert that people have new thoughts (A8), contribute to the activity (A24), learn useful things (L14), and (to a lesser extent) concentrate on significant aspects of the task, (L7). Curiously, L16, our group having the same problems as other groups, shows

Table 31 - Actual and Ideal ALP Items Correlated with Achievement

	ACTUAL ITEMS			IDEAL ITEMS		
	Item No.	No. of Correlations.	Rank Mean in Composite	Item No.	No. of Correlations	Rank Mean in Composite
Positive	*A8	12	4	*A24	11	3
	*A9	7	20	A17	10	9
	*A24	7	3	P10	7	13
	L14	6	1	*A8	6	5
	L7	5	10	A23	6	11
	L16	5	12	L14	6	4
				P19	6	2
Negative	P1	6	13	L4	7	15
	L21	6	22.5	L6	8	16
	L4	6	11	*A13	8	21
	*A13	6	21	L16	15	23
	L16	7	12	L22	17	24
	*P18	8	22.5			
	L6	8	14			

Note: Five correlations and above were used.
There are 24 possible correlations for the Actual and for the Ideal.
* = Common core items
All is the only common core not included.
It had four negative correlations in the Actual and three negative correlations in the Ideal.

five positive correlations with achievement measures and seven negative correlations. This would fit its middle-range ranking by the composite.

The one item on which achievers seem to run counter to the composite is A9, rapping with classmates or teacher. The higher the achievement the more likely this item is to be raised above its generally low level of characteristicness. It is possible that the young high achievers have more class-related anxiety to deal with and/or that, being more successful, affluent, and satisfied, they find interpersonal interaction less risky.

The Actual-Negative Items

High achievers tend to perceive less prominently than other students certain middle-rated items: group decision-making (P1), having reasons as a group (L4), exemplifying good group process (L6). They also tend to reject more than other students the low-rated group-oriented items having shared purposes (L21) and capitalizing on diverse backgrounds (P18). In addition, they tend to downgrade even more than the others the clarification of previous personal (private, subjective) experiences (A13).

The overall impression is that high achievers tend to be less aware (and low achievers more aware) of dimensions of group life with the exception of one-to-one rapping which may be a concomitant of immaturity and/or of need to reduce greater classroom-related anxiety.

The Ideal-Positive Items

High achievers tend to accentuate certain items that are already generally highly valued: contributing to group activity (A24), learning useful things (L14), thinking new thoughts (A8), and helping each other

(P19). In addition to these cultural cliches, they also rank higher certain middle-rated items: smooth continuity (P10), absorption in tasks (A23), and sense of excitement (A17). Of special interest is that we accomplished a great deal (P3), which is ranked first in the composite, has no positive correlation with achievement; nor do problem solving (P15) and meeting task requirements (L12). It appears that the values of achievers are more invested in the conditions of learning than in its procedures or goals.

The Ideal-Negative Items

The strongly negative items tend to support these inferences. Achievers tend to reject assertions that their ideal class would be aware of issues that trouble the larger society (L22), or of the problems that occur in other groups as well as their own (L16), or of activity as useful to clarify previous personal experiences (A13). These personal and social awarenesses would, presumably, interfere with the bland, nonrisk, impersonal conditions that they seek. Two other items which suggest constraints by the group are also rejected in the ideal: having good reasons as a group (L4) and exemplifying good group process (L6).

The overall impression is that the ideal classroom of high achievers supports and protects impersonal performance undistracted by social realities.

The Achiever's Actual vs. Ideal

The table below illuminates those items that are consistently positive or consistently negative in both the Actual and the Ideal. Those items outside the double lines are inconsistent across the Actuals and the Ideals.

Table 32 - Comparison of Actual and Ideal Correlates with Achievement

	Positive	Negative	Other
Positive	A8 A24 L14		A17 P10 A23 P19
Ideal Negative		L4 A13 L6	L22 L16
Other	A9 L7 L16	P1 L21 L16 P18	

Consistently Positive--In both his descriptions of the Actual class and his rankings of items for the Ideal class, achievers see most clearly the student role. One contributes and one gets new ideas which can be turned to some use later.

Consistently Negative--These items seem to set the parameters for playing the student role if one is going to do it well. High achievers do not see or value the time-consuming process of negotiating and ratifying good group reasons. Neither do they see or value the good group process that lays the foundation for arriving at these group reasons. And, more than other students, they reject the idea of clarifying personal experiences.

Other Items--It was suggested that in their actual classes, rapping with other students and the teacher (A9) may reflect the need to reduce classroom-induced anxiety. In the ideal, this would not be necessary, A17, A23, P10, and P19--along with the negative correlates L22 and L16--describe a trouble-free milieu in which they are work-involved, things run smoothly, and they help each other; anxiety is lower and/or can be dealt with as it arises. Additionally, the relationship of L7 to high achievement in the actual and its absence in the ideal suggests that dependence on strong focussing by the teacher is less strong in the more supportive ideal milieu.

Summary

The three conditions most consistently related to achievement across all five schools are younger age, more satisfaction, and higher socio-economic level. Either boys or girls may be the high achievers.

Examination of the ALP items correlated with achievement suggest the following generalizations about the "achievement subculture."

1. Achievement is correlated with awareness and valuing of the common expectations of the role of student.

2. Achievement is correlated with valuing those aspects of classroom life that support and protect impersonal performance by individuals.

3. Achievement is correlated with rejection of wider issues, group processes, and private preoccupations that might interfere with performance.

4. Achievement is less related to concern for the content of task purposes and procedures than for working conditions.

5. Achievement is correlated with social-emotional immaturity.

Achievement vs. Satisfaction Subcultures

The actual and ideal items identified as correlates of achievement and satisfaction are recapitulated in Tables 33 and 34.

The "Actual" Correlates

Of the thirteen actual items that correlate positively or negatively with achievement, four are not correlated with satisfaction. Of the 17 items that correlate significantly with satisfaction, nine do not correlate with achievement. Of the eight items that correlate significantly with both, six are in the same direction, one is in the opposite direction and one shows up significantly in both directions. Satisfaction is clearly the more inclusive or multidimensional construct. We shall first consider the common correlates, then the opposite correlates, and finally the items correlated with one variable but not to the other.

Table 33 - Satisfaction vs. Achievement: Actual

		Achievement					
		+Correlates		-Correlates		Insig. Corr.	
	Group	Item	Rank	Item	Rank	Item	Rank
Satisfaction	A					A23	18
						P20	16
						A17	24
						P15	2
						P3	7
	B	L14	1	L6	14		
	(+)	A24	3			P19	9
	C			L21	22.5	P10	8
	(-)					A11	15
				P18+	22.5		
	D			A13+	21		
	(--)	L16	12	L16	12	L22	19
				L4	11		
	0	A8	4	P1	13		
		A9	20				
		L7	10				

Two high-ranked SA items, L14 and A24, are significantly correlated positively to both satisfaction and achievement. These items are "Some of the things we found out will be useful in other situations" and "I felt like contributing to the activity." Both groups accept these general cultural cliches ("givens") about the utility of education and the expectation of active participation.

Three items, among the four lowest-ranked, are more characteristic of the dissatisfied and of low achievers. They are L21, "Our shared purpose was strong enough to help guide our behavior," P18, "The diversity of our individual backgrounds aided the group," and A13, "I felt that the activity clarified some previous personal experiences." A13 and P18 were earlier identified as cultural specifications of what is not expected in "education." L21, the condition most essential for cooperation, flies in the face of the overwhelming ethos of collective, separate, often competitive achievement. With respect to these three common items, the achievers and satisfieds simply represent a little more strongly the dominant tendencies of the population as a whole. Moving more to the middle range of characteristicness, ranked 11th, is L4, "As a group we had good reasons for what we did." It appears that both the achievers and satisfieds, each with their own brand of adequacy, perceive less and are probably less dependent on "group" (teacher?) reasons.

L16, "The problem we had of working together occurs regularly in other groups as well" is significantly related both positively and negatively to different measures of achievement. Process problems may be especially visible to high achievers as obstacles to achievement; and to low achievers as distracting, probably high-priority realities. Either perception goes along with dissatisfaction.

The remaining item is significantly related both (+) to satisfaction and (-) to achievement: L6, "Our meeting at times exemplified good group process." This item beautifully contrasts the satisfied's awareness with the achiever's unawareness of the classroom as a semi-communal enterprise. This can be taken as the keynote for the interpretation of the remaining, less dramatic items which are significant for either satisfaction or achievement but not for both.

Consider the six items whose greater awareness distinguishes the satisfied from the rest of the population. Helping each other, P19, and contributing one's own skills to make the meeting productive, P20, suggest cooperation in both the formal and informal social structures. "I was excited by what was happening," A17, and "time passed quickly for me," A23, characterize the "involved" member, having high affect and being absorbed in what is going on. "We accomplished a great deal," P3, and "We ran into problems and solved them," P15, are perceptions of a productive group.

The dissatisfieds are distinguished from all the others by three items. P10, "one thing flowed from another," would seem antithetical to the dramatic, episodic character of problem-solving; for genuine coping involves periods of uncertainty and anxiety as well as of undistracted work. L22, being "troubled" by issues that are "prevalent in the larger society," would be seen as a barrier to productive cooperation. The negative status of A11, being "the sort of person I wanted to be" suggests that the satisfieds, more than the others, embrace this common cultural "given" which regards as irrelevant the extent to which classrooms are congenial to the way of life of individuals.

The three items that are highly correlated to achievement but insignificantly correlated with satisfaction help to spell out the limits of the achiever's cosmos: "It made me think some new thoughts of my own," A8; "I felt like rapping with the teacher and other classmates after the meeting," A9; and "we concentrated our activity on the significant aspects of the task," L7. The emphasis on cognitive stimulation speaks for itself. The interest in rapping *does* suggest involvement of a rather narrow sort: in the absence of other social dimensions, rapping is probably a device to reduce the stresses of meeting the procedural and task requirements through which "achievement" is produced. Finally, the extremely narrow focus of L7 clearly excludes personal, social, and emergent aspects of experiencing.

There remains P1, "we decided what we wanted to do and we did it." The finding is that the higher the achievement the less the perception of this feature. It is hard to find an alternative to the interpretation that achievement is related in the students' experience in meeting imposed (but probably "acceptable") specifications as distinguished from being actively involved in generating the specifications and inquiring on his own.

In summary, the generalization that pulls together the positive correlations is that persons who are most satisfied tend to be more aware of the class as a somewhat cooperative helpful group whereas the achievers are much more narrowly oriented to individual cognitive and performance learning. The negative correlations suggest that both groups accept the cultural expectations of education as impersonally and non-societally oriented, with the achievers being more submissive to and the satisfieds less aware of, external sources of constraint and demand.

Generalizations as bald as these leave one wishing to put in a few ifs, ands, and buts. We would like to make clear that the greater social awareness of the satisfieds probably connotes acceptance of the social dimensions that exist much more than it serves an active interest in developing a truly communal situation. They seem to sense what it would mean to be a cooperative member, but they are much less clear on the group conditions that would make that sort of membership effective. The group remains a milieu for the role they take; it is not seen as an active agent with its own purposes and raison detre which both supports and demands individual effort.

The "Ideal" Correlates

The numbers of items in Ideal Table 34 is about the same as in Actual Table 33, but there are considerable differences among the particular items. Eight items are significantly correlated with both satisfaction and achievement. Of these, six are in the same direction and two are opposite. As before, the achievers are additionally distinguished from the population in general by four items and the satisfieds by nine. Among the eight common correlates, the balance has shifted, with twice as many positive and less than half as many negative correlations. The overall impression is that the satisfieds and achievers move closer together and

Table 34 - Satisfaction vs. Achievement: Ideal

		Achievement					
		+Correlates		-Correlates		Insig. Corr.	
	Group	Item	Rank	Item	Rank	Item	Rank
Satisfaction	A (++)	L14	4			P5	12
		P10	13				
	B	A8	5			L12	10
						L7	17
						P3	1
		P19	2				
		A23	11	A13	21		
	C (-)					A9	20
						P18	22
	D (--)	A17	9	L22	-24	A11	14
						L21	19
		A24	3	L16	23		
	O			L4	15		
				L6	16		

that the chief distinction is that the achievers remain more oriented to products (achievement, results) whereas the satisfieds shift their orientation from processes to procedures. More specifically, the achievers include some items having to do with individual affect and interpersonal support and the satisfieds now include practically all of the items that spell out the procedures of instruction.

As before, we shall first consider the common correlates that best index the similarities and differences between achievers and satisfieds and then we will examine the items that distinguish both groups from the general population.

Four items are significantly correlated positively with both achievement and satisfaction. Of these, L14, learning useful things, carries over from the actuals. In addition, A8, thinking new thoughts, carries over for the achievers and P19, helping each other, carries over for the satisfieds. P10, one thing flowed from another, originally characteristic of the dissatisfieds, is now correlated positively with satisfaction. Both groups, in their ideal, value utility, helpfulness, cognitive stimulation, and continuity. These four items constitute a sort of mini-model: the goal is useful learning, the process is thinking, the supportive condition is peer helpfulness, and the demands follow a developmental sequence--presumably directed by the teacher.

The two doubly negative items are the same: less emphasis is on clarifying personal experiences, A13, and less "troubles" imported from "outside" societal issues, L22. The common element in these internal and external sorts of demands is that they would interfere with the smooth progression of lesson-oriented procedures.

A17, being excited by what was happening and A23, time passing quickly, are, in the ideal, characteristic of the achievers and the dissatisfieds. Both these items are, in the actual, correlates of being satisfied, and neither is related to achievement. In a nut shell, they suggest that the achievers would like tasks to be more interesting and authentic and the satisfieds would like to be less keyed up and less involved, possibly involuntarily, in the group's process. This distinction is elaborated by the singly-significant positive correlates.

Five items are characteristic of the satisfieds ideal and not of the achievers ideal: P5, knowledge of progress, L12, task requirements, L17, significant focus, P15 (as before) problem-solving, and P3 (as before) accomplishment. This new emphasis on procedure is felt to be accompanied by less excitement and less absorption (presumably in interpersonal or inter-member process). In line with this social de-emphasis, the satisfieds drop A24, feeling like contributing to activity of the group and, even more tellingly, the pivotal item L6, at times our meetings exemplified good group process. The achievers, on the other hand, retain A24 which is certainly consistent with their stronger ideal recognition of social-emotional factors that would accompany more authentic tasks.

As noted earlier, the procedures which are the means of achievement, are not distinctively valued by the achievers. Their value to the satisfieds seems to be simply that these are the matters of most concern to satisfied teachers whose operation is strongly supported by the satisfied students. In short the "satisfieds" desire for the procedures should be interpreted as more basically a desire to accept the things that teachers do rather than necessarily as a desire for more effective means to achieve.

With respect to the negative correlates, the dissatisfieds' ideals and actuals are substantially similar: five items remain the same in both actual and ideal, one is added and two are dropped in the ideal. (The two that are dropped are retained by the low achievers.) A11, being the sort of person I want to be, P18, capitalizing on diverse backgrounds, and L21, guidance from group purposes remain objects of dissatisfaction; and their negative status for the satisfied suggests, as indicated before, their greater acceptance of the cultural "givens" which proscribe these features. The new item of dissatisfaction in the ideal is A9, rapping, and this lessened emphasis is of a piece with the greater wish for effective structure and flow. Their dropping of the negative status of L4, group reasons, reinforces the greater acceptance of pedagogical structure and their dropping of L6, group process problems, suggests a realignment of goals that would make L16 irrelevant.

At the same time, the greater openness to social dimensions in the achiever's ideal is signalled by their addition of L22, being "troubled" by societal issues, now recognized as an interference; and their dropping of the negative status of L21, group purpose, L16, process problems, and P1, deciding what to do.

Thus the picture is completed. In the discussion, our rhetoric, adopted for convenience, may be somewhat misleading. We have spoken of shifts or changes from the actual to the ideal patterns when, in fact the two patterns co-exist. Thus the more accurate re-phrasing of the state of affairs is that the satisfieds accept in the actual more of the realities of social process factors at the same time they would like more pedagogical structuring. And the achievers with they could add to the grade-getting features that are prominent for them in the actual class a good many more dimensions of personal meaningfulness. In a sense, the satisfieds would like more control through work over the social conditions they are sensitive to and the achievers would like more enrichment, more support, and less boredom in their quest for achievement.

Discussion:

In the first section of this chapter, we identified the community's interest in "achievement" and we wondered whether that part of classroom life that is oriented to achievement supports or gets in the way of the broader range of educative opportunities. We ended the introductory discussion with the question of whether there is necessarily a trade-off between opportunity and benefit--that is, whether achievement is at the cost of multi-dimensional learnings (especially in the personal-social-societal domain) or conversely, whether satisfaction is at the cost of high achievement.

Several of the findings help to clarify these ruminations. First, there tends to be some relationship (whose strength varies from one school to another) between satisfaction and achievement. The satisfied person tends also to achieve. There is no trade-off; if there were, the correlations would be negative.

Second, the subcultures of the satisfieds and the achievers do differ somewhat. In describing their perceptions of actual classrooms, we said that the satisfieds "tend to be more aware of the class as a somewhat co-operative, helpful group whereas the achievers are much more narrowly oriented to individual cognitive and performance learning" We added that "both groups accept the cultural expectations of education as impersonally and non-societally oriented." In their ideal images, the satisfieds and the achievers come closer together. The achievers value some personal-social variables that would make the achievement efforts more authentic; and the satisfieds now value most of the pedagogical procedures set up by the teachers. It is interesting that neither group values achievement per se: the achievers value the sort [illegible] conditions of life that happen to be conducive to achievement; and the satisfied value the teachers pedagogical efforts simply because they are so prominent a part of the way of life they are satisfied with.

It seems unlikely that the somewhat different orientations of achievers and satisfieds are consciously chosen; they are simply part of somewhat different styles of life. Because of their different orientations and styles of life, the two groups perceive the classroom environment somewhat differently. The achievers style of life is one congruent with the processes that result in achievement; the satisfieds style of life is one in which one values what exists--a style which, in"Classroom Grouping for Teachability" we described as "an indiscriminate liking for anything that the teacher sets up." There are probably other styles of life in the classroom, too-possibly one corresponding to each different kind of output measure used by the researcher.

There remains, however, one fact that puts the whole enterprise of the classroom in a completely unexpected light, and that is that satisfaction and achievement both tend to be negatively correlated with age. "Achievement" in school, as in other institutionalized organizations, is a game for the immature. As we shall see in the next chapter, it is justified by myths and determined by techniques. It seeks to exclude messy social realities; and it proscribes the dialectical processes through which individuals and societies achieve maturity.

Chapter 10- Education in the Midwestern High School

The Domain of Discourse

Our inquiry has been for the purpose of establishing a general "base line" against which Ethos patterns of particular schools, classes, and subjects can be compared. This "base line" is a statistical abstraction; and it does not necessarily describe any actual school or class. What it does do is identify things that are most common to five contrasting schools and also things that vary most among the schools. The perceptions that are most common represent the expectations and values of the "larger culture"; the views that are most diverse represent the effects of local particulars.

From the standpoint of intelligent discussion of educational policy and of the potentialities for changing schools it is important to distinguish the cultural "givens" from the local variations. It is important because the givens represent deeply ingrained traditions and every effort to change or improve schools has to buck these traditions. Experience with such efforts has been that as soon as the active innovators leave the school, the new ways of doing things collapse. The new procedures may remain on the books, but their underlying spirit, meaning, and educational impact are assimilated back within the common traditions. The minority or pressure groups that wanted the change are temporarily appeased but in the longer view, the net result is that the adoption of a few superficial procedures merely served the purpose of protecting and maintaining the tradition (and the official dominant society). In a word, the school, as an institution, has tended for the most part to reflect the shifting moods, economic bases, race relations, cold war, and other matters that defensively preoccupy the "official" and "productive" components of American society.

It is in the context of these very broad propositions that our findings about The Midwestern High School are significant. In the next two reports, our attention will shift from The School as an institution to five schools as working organizations and to fifty classrooms as the loci of educative processes. In these reports the findings will make sense in the contexts of of school-community relations, subject disciplines, and pedagogical methods.

What then, have we found out about the Institution of the Midwestern High School? How may we call to order the myriad, often repetitive details of the preceding chapters?

The Themes: Overview

In this final discussion, we shall first identify four major themes that run through the data. Next we shall discuss each one, using it as a nexus for pulling together the findings from all the chapters.

The themes emerge from a particular way of listing the 24 items. The data were the ranks assigned by students and teachers to each item in order to describe their actual classes. The grand average of the students on each item was averaged with that of the teachers on the same item: and these combined averages were then used to rank-order the items in our list (table 35, column 1). For two-thirds of the items, the rankings by students and teachers are substantially similar (e.g. within 3 ranks of each other). On the remaining 8 items, the rankings may differ by as much as 11 ranks. These disagreed-upon rankings are indicated by parentheses around the figure for the student-teacher average. One of the eight items A23, is not included in the further analyses because its pattern is unique and may result as much from semantic confusion as from differences in perception. (A glance at A23 in table 2 will further explain what is strange about the item).

The four themes emerge as clusters of adjacent items in the composite student-teacher averages just described. It may be helpful to overview these themes before using them to integrate all the findings.

The first most characteristic theme is Common Expectations. It is composed of five items; L14, A24, P15, A8, and P3--which is transitional to the next theme.

The second theme is Instructional Features. These represent the visible, planned aspects of activity. The five items are: P10, L12, P5, L7, and L4--which is transitional to the next theme.

The ten items of the first two themes bring us down to the region of more ambiguous or variable items that are sometimes characteristic and other times not characteristic.

The third theme is Group Maintenance. It contains five items: L6, P1, L16, P19, and L22. In addition, A11 is transitional to the fourth theme.

The fourth theme, representing the relatively uncharacteristic features, presents a strikingly coherent and comprehensive pattern of Dialectical Processes. It contains seven items: A17, A9, A2, P20, A13, L21, and P18.

Our discussion of each theme will consider the extent to which:

a. It is culturally given. (column 2, from category A, Chapter 5)
b. Teachers and/or students wish to upgrade its features. (column 3, from categories B,C, and D, Chapter 5)
c. Teachers and/or students wish to downgrade its features. (column 4, from categories E-H, Chapter 5)
d. Teachers and students perceive its features as common or diverse among schools. (columns 13-16, from Chapter 6)
e. Teachers and students perceive its features as common or diverse within schools. (columns 17-20, from Chapter 6)
f. It is embraced or rejected by satisfied and dissatisfied students. (columns 5-8, from Chapter 3)
g. It is embraced or rejected by high and low achievers. (columns 9-12, from Chapter 9)

Since the preceding chapters offer detailed analyses of these matters, our present aim will be to make the discussions as concise as possible. We shall conclude the discussion by suggesting a number of implications--problems and issues--in the Midwestern High School.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 35 - SUMMARY: Significant Item Relationships

Item	T+S Mean	(Chapter 5) Cult. Ass.	Up T,S	Down T,S	(Chapter 8) Satisfaction: Actual +	Actual -	Ideal +	Ideal -	(Chapter 9) Achievement: Actual +	Actual -	Ideal +	Ideal -	(Chapter 6) Between Schools Actual Sim.	Actual Div.	Ideal Sim.	Ideal Div.	Within Schools: Actual Sim.	Actual Div.	Ideal Sim.	Ideal Div.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
L14	1.0				L14		L14		L14		L14		S,T				S,T		S	T
A24	2.5	A24			A24				A24		A24		T		T		T		S	
P15	2.8			T+S	P15		P15						S,T			T				T
A8	3.8	A8					A8		A8		A8								T	
P3*	6.0		S		P3		P3								S			T		T
P10	7.0			S		P10	P10				P10							S		S
L12	7.3			S			L12									S	S,T			T
P5	(8.0)			T+S			P5										S	T	S	T
L7	9.3			T+S			L7		L7					T						
L4	11.8			S		L4				L4		L4	S	T						
L6	13.3			T	L6					L6		L6	S				S			
P1	14.0		S							P1				S		T		S		S
L16	(14.2)			T+S		L16			L16	L16		L16			T				S,T	
P19	(14.5)		T+S		P19		P19				P19		T	S	S,T			T	S	
L22	(14.5)			T+S		L22		L22				L22		S					T	
A11	15.5	A11				A11		A11						T		S		S		S
A17	(19.0)		T+S		A17			A17			A17			S		S				S,T
A9	19.0	A9						A9	A9					T	S	T	T		T	S
A2	(19.5)		T										T	S				T		
P20	(20.0)		T+S		P20								T			T	T			
A13	21.0	A13				A13		A13		A13		A13			T					T
L21	21.8		S			L21		L21		L21							S			
P18	22.8	P18				P18		P18		P18					S					
A23	(12.5)				A23			A23			A23			T		S	T	S	T	S

* In the text, P3 is discussed as the last item in the first cluster, but it's mean of 6.0 clearly places it as the top item of the second cluster.

Theme 1. Common Expectations

Students are expected to "feel like" contributing to activities (A24) and they are expected to "think new thought of their own" (A8). These two cultural "givens" define what is expected to be characteristic of classrooms. The three other items spell out some associated, probably instrumental, features. One is expected to learn some things "that will be useful in other situations" (L14), and teachers wish to de-emphasize this pressure-- they downgrade it by 5.5 ranks. The basic process for satisfying the cultural expectations is through "facing problems and solving them" (P15); teachers and students wish to downgrade this feature, which probably includes doing "exercises," by 5.2 ranks. Finally, the enterprise is expected to "accomplish a great deal" (P3), and students would like more of this, upgrading it from 6th to first rank in their ideal class.

These most characteristic items account for half of the most common features among the five schools. Teachers and students agree on the usefulness of learning and on the expectation of solving problems. In addition, teachers agree on the expectation of wanting to contribute. Within the schools, the classes tend to agree (teachers and students) on learning useful things; and as before, the teachers also agree on feeling like contributing. On the other hand, the teachers of the ten classes within each school tend to disagree markedly on the amount of "accomplishment" in both their actual and ideal classes.

Comparing ideologies among schools, students tend to agree on the high value of accomplishment; teachers agree on the high value of contributing, and teachers tend to disagree on what value to place on problem-solving.

Comparing ideologies of the ten classes within each school, students value useful learning and contributing; and teachers agree on the high value of thinking new thoughts. The greatest differences among ideologies are all characteristic of teachers. In addition to the disagreement on how much "accomplishment" would be ideal, the classroom teachers also disagree on the emphasis to be given to problem solving and to learning useful things.

The more satisfied the student, the more prominently he sees four of the five items as characteristic of his actual and ideal classes. Utility, problem-solving, and accomplishment are common to both kinds of classes. The achievers see three of the items-- usefulness, contribution, and new thoughts-- as characteristic of both their actual and ideal classes. Dissatisified and low achieving students see all of the five items as uncharacteristic of both their actual and ideal classes.

Thus the expectations generally perceived as most characteristic of the five-school composite tend to be seen even more prominently by satisfied students and, to a lesser extent by achievers (who leave out the accomplishment and problem-solving features). Students would like more sense of accomplishment and teachers would like less pressure to "learn things useful in other situations." Both feel that problems (and exercises) figure too prominently-- a hint that the technical and impersonal organization of work may be felt as a constraint on life in the classroom.

These common expectations clearly represent the popular understanding of what education is all about. One goes to school to learn useful things; to think new thoughts; to learn to cope with problems. He is supposed to put forth effort (to want to "contribute"). And becoming educated is an important accomplishment.

Theme 2. Instructional Features

Here we have the items--all of then-- that describe or imply the chief features of lessons. All of them are easy to judge more "objectively" than the components of the first theme. Their lower rankings probably result from the fact that the prominence of the items differs with pedagogical methods which in turn differ among subjects (as well as among individual teachers.)

The image of teaching that best characterizes the Midwestern High School is: that one understands and meets the task requirements (L12); that he gets feedback as to how well he is doing (P5); that tasks are arranged in a smooth sequence (P10); that the group has reasons for what it does (L4); and that attention is directed to the "significant aspects of the task" (L7). Of these features, students tend to be more aware of feedback than teachers (by 6 ranks).

Students generally feel that all five of these features are too dominant-- by 4 to 8.7 ranks. Teachers agree with this discontent with respect to the two that have most to do with their role as monitors of student effort: giving feedback and directing attention. These findings clearly fit with the desire of both students and teachers to downgrade the problem-solving emphasis of the first theme.

On these items, students see the schools most alike with respect to the group having reasons for its activity; and teachers see the schools as most different in this respect. Teachers also see as most different the extent of focussing on significant aspects; it is as if teachers are more responsive than students to differences of rationality among student populations. The only significant ideological commonality or diversity is with respect to the students' ideals for meeting task requirements. For the most part, schools do not differ much with respect to instructional features.

As might be expected, classes within the school show more significant commonalities, presumably reflecting school standards, and more differences, presumably due to subject matters. The extent of feedback (knowledge of progress) is the most interesting pedagogical item among classes: students in all the classes agree unusually well with respect to both their actual and ideal classes; and teachers disagree markedly on its actual and ideal amount. (But both groups think it is too prominent). Within the same schools, teachers and students agree unusually well with their colleagues on the extent of meeting task requirements, and teachers disagree markedly on how much of this there *should* be. Finally, across classes, students disagree markedly on how much "one thing flowed from another" in both their actual and ideal classes. It seems reasonable to think that this item best indexes in the students' minds the control by lesson plan (and by the teacher). While the diversity between classes might be due to differences among subjects, the ideological diversity inclines us to think that the item is more reflective of differences in deeper needs for "structure." We have already noted that in general, students feel that all the instructional features are too prominent (including smooth continuity); but the discontent with these specific procedural constraints overlays diversity at the deeper level of reactions to and need for control.

The most striking differences with respect to instructional features are those between satisfieds and the achievers. We have already seen that these groups accept 60 to 80 percent of the cultural givens (theme 1), but when it comes to the five implementing instructional procedures, the satisfieds idealize four of them (omitting group having reasons) and the achievers idealize only one (along with the satisfieds): smooth continuity. We noted in chapter 8 that the satisfieds tend to idealize all the items that teachers are satisfied with. Of the nine items that distinguish the ideology of the satisfieds, eight are with reference to the first two most characteristic themes; the remaining item is "We all helped each other." Thus in their ideals, the satisfieds for the most part accept and value the features that are generally seen as most characteristic of actual classes.

This finding is very much in line with what we found in Classroom Grouping for Teachability. The factor that accounted for the most variance in our assessment battery was labelled the "goody-goody" factor. Here is our description of it: "(This factor) is contributed to by all the scores through which a child says how well he likes things-teachers, methods of working, goals, other students, and so on. It is also contributed to by scores which, taken together, give a picture of conformity: the student who is high on this factor likes everything that is expected of him, no matter what it is. It is accompanied by rather low-level work, and by lack of emotional involvement. There is rejection of fight and flight, and of all but rather muted expressions of feeling. We could not help but wonder if this factor does not portray a highly successful adjustment to the demands of the typical classroom; and, if so, it should probably be called the "survival" factor. It is more characteristic of upper- than of lower- class (economically) children."

With respect to actual classes, the achievers see more focussing by the teacher. Both satisfieds and achievers are less aware of reasons than the population in general; and the achievers wish for even less than they see.

In sum, students would like to downgrade all five instructional procedures but the satisfieds want more of them. The satisfied students, as noted earlier, clearly identify much more than other students with their **teachers and with the common expectations generally held for schools.**

Theme 3. Group Maintenance

The items in this theme average to neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic as compared to the items in the other themes. Four of the items are seen quite differently by teachers and students in either their actual or ideal classes: these items tend to be role-sensitive and subjective. They represent dimensions of group life that are most salient to being a member of the class as a managed social organization.

Two items place the class within the larger society: problems of working together are characteristic of other groups as well (L16); and troublesome "issues" are "prevalent in the larger society." (L22) Students are more aware of the former and teachers are more aware of the latter; both groups would like to be rid of such problems and issues, ranking them 23rd and 24th in their ideal class. The extent to which "we all helped each other", (P19), is judged much greater by students (rank 9) than by teachers (rank 20), but both wish it were highly characteristic (ranks 2 and 5, respectively). Both groups rate "at times our class exemplified good group process" (L6) in the middle, and the teachers downgrade this feature (by 5.5 ranks) in their ideal--which probably goes along with their general discomfort with monitoring student performance (P5 and L7, above). The students and teachers put "we decided what we wanted to do and we did it" (P1) in the middle and the students (but not the teachers) would like to upgrade it (by 7ranks). The middle rated transitional item, "I felt that during the activity I could be the sort of person I wanted to be" (A11), is one of the cultural givens and implies that role-comfort is basically irrelevant to the definition of schooling.

The theme, in brief, is that the class has some difficulties that are characteristic of almost any real group; that it would like to be rid of them; that it wished the informal structure was more supportive (and the group more cohesive). Students would like more say in shaping their life and teachers wish they could be freer of the role of disciplinarian. Perhaps the most striking (but understandable) aspect is the wishful rejection of the inevitable process problems of working together and dealing with societal issues that all groups have to contend with. Clearly, learning to cope in these areas is not considered in any way to be part of the mission of education.

Among the five schools, the effort to exemplify good groups--i.e. be free of process problems--is perceived similarly by students and the extent of students helping each other is perceived similarly--as quite uncharacteristic--by teachers. Significant diversity among schools is perceived only by the students; and this is with respect to three of the five items: deciding together, helping each other, and being troubled by societal issues (e.g. racial). Clearly, the role of member is quite different across schools; and this is another way of stating the earlier conclusion that it is the school as a social milieu that the students are most sensitive to. In their ideals, schools are alike in the wish of students and teachers to be rid of troublesome societal issues; and the teachers are unusually similar in their rejection of typical process problems. The only unusual diversity among schools is the disagreement amnog faculties as to the extent to which students should participate in decision making.

As for classes within schools, the pattern is the same as between schools for being a "good" group and for student decision-making. As for being free of group problems, the students within the various classes show unusual agreement, along with their teachers. Helping each other, which was seen similarly by the various school faculties, is seen diversely by teachers within a school; and the students within a school tend to agree on their ideal for this item. Finally, teachers within schools, as well as the faculties across schools, would like to be rid of troublesome societal issues, but the students within the school show no unusual similarity or diversity of opinion about this matter. Overall, more than half the similarities and diversities apply both across schools and across classes within schools. Thus this theme appears to be pretty well imbedded in the general culture; and most of what has been said about it probably applies just as well to businesses, hospitals, and other institutional organizations in society.

As might be expected, these qualities of the member role show interesting differences between the satisfieds and the achievers. The satisfieds are optimists: they perceive more that the class is a good group and that students help each other and they perceive less that it has problems of working together and that it is troubled by societal issues. They also perceive less that one can be the sort of person he wants to be--which adds to our suspicion that being satisfied is primarily a mechanism of successful "adjustment." The ideology of the satisfieds is congruent with their perceptions of the actual situation with respect to these latter three items.

The achievers see and want less of "good group process." They are less aware of student decision-making. They are both more and less aware of typical problems (depending on which measures of achievement are considered). Like the satisfieds, in their ideals, they want more helping and less trouble from larger issues. The major differences between achievers and satisfieds is the former's lesser feeling of effective membership. They see the same problems as the satisfieds but they also sense less support from the group in dealing with them.

Perhaps the most interestimg question generated in the discussion of this theme is: should classrooms be similar to other social organizations and thus indoctrimate students to accept their way of life (the "hidden curriculum") or should classroom organizations face organizational realities and teach students to cope with them? If one prefers the latter course, he is in for trouble becuase, as we shall now see, the dialectical processes required for such learning are not only uncharacteristic of classrooms, they fly in the face of the traditional definition of what schools are like.

Theme 4. Dialectical Processes

The remaining seven items hang together beautifully in the pattern of American Democratic ideology that we love to talk about. And these items are the most uncharacteristic of classroom life. Whatever the Midwestern High School is about, it certainly is not giving the students experience in living up to our polito-ideological sentiments!

Let us show how the items go together. We may begin with the democratic political ideal: that the society capitalizes on diversity of individual backgrounds (P18), and that persons contribute their special skills for the benefit of the community (P20). The condition under which society can utilize diversity is that it is unified in common shared purposes (L21). Wisdom is sought as individuals clarify their own personal experiences (A13), partly through rapping with each other (A9) and partly through challenging each other (A2). Participation in this dialectic is involving and one has a sense of "excitement" (A17).

Of these seven items, three are among the cultural givens that define what a school is not; and a fourth barely misses (by .5 ranks) being added to the three. The ruled-out parts of the pattern are: capitalizing on background diversity, having shared group purposes that guide behavior, clarifying private personal experience, and rapping with colleagues.

The remaining three items are not accepted as given. Students and teachers want more excitement (by 15 and 13 ranks, respectively). They want more utilization of individual resources-(e.g. "special skills")--by 8 and 14 ranks, respectively. The students, who probably read "challenging each other" as "attacking each other", are satisfied with its low rank; but the teachers, reading "challenge" as "stimulation," would like to upgrade it by 11 ranks. In short, the wish is that the classroom would be less dull (the students rank excitement 24th); that students could have the sort of self-esteem and sense of first class citizenship that comes from contributing; and that interpersonal transactions would be more stimulating (from the teachers' viewpoint). But in the absence of the rest of the dialectical process, such hopes are probably unrealistic.

The faculties among the schools see that the schools are most alike with respect to lack of interpersonal challenge (ranked 24th). They perceive the greatest diversity with respect to interpersonal rapping. The students see the schools as most diverse with respect to excitement and interpersonal challenge. In their ideologies, students in the various schools agree on the low value of clarifying personal experience. The ideological differences for students across the various schools are greatest with respect to the values of rapping and of contribution of individual skills to the class. In their ideologies, the students are afraid of interpersonal trust and diversity; and they disagree on whether school should even be exciting.

With regard to the classes within each school, the students perceive as most similar the low place accorded to shared purposes. The teachers see as most similar the lack of rapping and of individual contribution to the group. The teachers disagree most on the amount of interpersonal challenge. In their ideologies, teachers are well satisfied with the low position of rapping whereas students disagree on how much there should be. Teachers and students also are most diverse with respect to the desired amount of excitement; and teachers disagree on the extent to which classroom activity should clarify personal experience.

The more satisfied the student, the more he perceives of excitement and individual contribution; and the less he sees of personal clarification, shared purposes, and diversity of backgrounds. In short he wants the fun without facing the internal and external conflicts. In his ideology, the more satisfied the student the more he idealizes the low position of five of the 7 uncharacteristic items that comprise the dialectical theme--which is entirely consistent with his idealization of the high position of the characteristic items. Whatever is true one way or the other of the situation, the satisfied tends to want more of.

The achievers perceive more rapping and they are like the satisfieds in their lesser awareness of the sources of conflict. In their ideals, the achievers would like more excitement and even less clarification of personal experience.

In summing up the discussion of this theme, it seems to us that the word for what classrooms are not is "community"; and that they are not communities in the same way that other institutions and "communities" in the society are not communities; that teachers and students wish they could have some of the dimensions of community that would make task work more authentic, but they don't want to bother with the developmental processes through which these goodies can be obtained.

The Four Themes as Cultural Statistical Artifacts

Now that we have seen what the four themes are, it is not hard to "explain" them. The data come from fifty classes distributed among five schools. The classes and schools are very diverse. Among the fifty classes, almost every conceivable style of teaching and of group life can be found. But when we throw the classes all together in the same pot, their individual differences cancel out. What remains is their common biases. These biases are statistical abstractions; they are characteristic of the whole aggregation whose existence has no reality beyond that wreaked by the wonders of adding things up and striking their averages. Given this understanding, the relative position of the four themes of the Midwestern High School (the overall statistical artifact) is not hard to explain.

The first theme represents the educational mythology of the common culture. It is what the students and teachers have most in common. Therefore it turns out to be most characteristic (however salient it may be) of all classrooms.

The second theme represents the most observable aspects of classroom life. Presumably there should be high agreement on these features: a description of common pedagogical activities. But this agreement is reduced by the fact that the classes are in different subjects. Math teaching is quite different from teaching social studies. Although the component features are the same among subjects, their relative importance differs among subjects. But there is enough similarity that the theme is in second place.

The third theme, having to do with the social-psychological aspects of group life, differs not only among subjects but also among group compositions and styles of teaching. For example, group process problems are regarded as detrimental to teaching in college-bound math classes and yet may be the source of worthwhile curricular problems in an inner-city social studies class. Hence they average out to a low or middle-level of characteristicness, neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic as far as the composite is concerned.

Finally, the fourth theme, like the first, is culturally determined--negatively. If the first theme represents the mythology of education, the fourth theme represents the facts about society; and the school, as practice ground for societal indoctrination, will tend, on the average, to conform to the prevailing ethos of society.

Implications

The common expectations or mythology of education say that students are to learn useful things, participate, solve problems, get new ideas, and accomplish a lot. If we accept these common expectations as embracing the popular goals of education, then the question arises as to how well suited the instructional features are to the achievement of these goals. Can these goal-expectations be met primarily through the technical instructional features or do they require a fuller realization of such conditions as clarification of personal experience? Are we educators in the position of trying to make bricks without straw? Are societal expectations one thing and societal realities another?

The second implication is not a question so much as an observation: clearly the most acceptable changes in education are in the domain of the second theme: techniques and procedures. But the question arises as to whether technical and procedural changes can do more than increase efficiency of doing what we are already doing. Unless the other dimensions, currently rejected in the general society, are involved, can we hope for any improvement in the quality of education, or in its ability to better meet the general expectations?

The third implication, with respect to the third theme, is should education face the realities of organizational life and help students cope with them rather than accepting them as inevitable imperfections to be avoided if at all possible? Can classrooms really ignore or suppress the conditions of their imbeddedness in the larger society and, if so, at what cost in individual self-realization and societal adaptation?

With respect to the fourth theme, two very serious questions emerge. First, can the technical procedures of schools be effective without greater attention to and encouragement of these culturally-denigrated processes? And second, can these processes, if necessary, be activated in the schools alone or must the idea of community first be realized in the society at large? Can educative experience be authentic in the absence or denial of these processes by the community; And if the students' experience is not authentic, can the common expectations be realized? It seems to us that this line of questioning suggests that any basic improvement of education in schools will have to be part, parcel, or byproduct of efforts to rebuild the sense of community in everyday life.

As we review these queries, it seems to us that the present advocates of accountability, behavior modification, and performance evaluation are right in seeing realistically what changes are possible and in believing that through these changes the under-groups may be helped to obtain diplomas; but they are wrong in thinking these changes will improve education in the sense of better meeting the societal expectations for education. On the other hand, we see that the romantics, with their accusations that schools are inhumane and inauthentic have a point, but they are wrong in heaping all the blame on the educational establishment. They must raise their sights to the level of the whole way of life; and this is asking more than anyone knows how to deal with. So we are trapped; and what each person must do will have to depend on what his conscience tells him.

****

But there may be a way out. That way is through careful inquiry. The fact is that, as asserted above, classrooms *do* vary. We can compare our fifty classes to the baseline picture that we have established above. We can pick out at least a few classes which deviate significantly from the general picture. We can examine these classes and try to figure out how they do it. And we can attempt to identify and describe the conditions that give rise to the more educative deviation. And thus we can open the door to a clearer understanding of policies useful for making the classroom Ethos and way of life more educative.

Appendix A: INterviews with Principals

Susan Arisman

Introduction

In this section of the report, it is our purpose to try to place the classrooms which were studied within the context of the school and the community in which they are imbedded. In a way different from the basic ALP data, this section was planned to give some insight into the spirit or character of the school. For the most part, questions were devised on the basis of the particular needs of the study by the members of the ALP staff. In addition, questions were also culled from such previous studies of organizational climate as Halpin and Croft's, from Coleman's survey of educational equality, and from sociological studies of formal organizations.

In each school a member of the research team interviewed the principal, and in one school the assistant principal as well, and collected any written records such as course catalogues and handbooks which were available. These interviews were supplemented by comments from teachers, direct observations of the school, and previous information received from other informants.

The questionnaire that was used is attached to the end of the descriptions. ¶ The data from the interview were placed into categories which hopefully identify different dimensions of life within each school. A short section on the demography was used to give a general description of the environment of each school. The next section on the curriculum demonstrates that although all the schools are "comprehensive," each has its own thrust or each places more value on one type of program than another. The sections on the students and the staff are an attempt to get at the internal characteristics--the relationships, the attitudes, and the activities. In this section it was assumed that what the principal says or does not say somehow is an indication of the relevance or importance of certain characteristics of the school. The section on the community tried to get at the way the school is imbedded in its larger context. These three sections on students, staff, and community are concerned with the different "publics" that are sharing in the life of the school. The section on internal structure is concerned with the way in which the staff and the students mesh. It tells something about the formalization of the organization, how loosely or how rigidly it operates. In the description of two schools from the large school system (G, A), this section was omitted because the information could be more easily incorporated into other parts.

Most of the information in this section comes from the principal. To avoid repetitious quoting of them, statements were only put in quotation marks for emphasis. Comments on the principals' statements are included in the text whenever they aid in understanding them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Community School

Demography: School C, the smallest school in the study with about 800 students, is located in a medium-sized city surrounded by large, prosperous farms. Agriculture and its allied industries provide the economic base for the city and dominate its ethos. Students at the school are drawn from every section of the community which covers a wide area. The city itself is made up of mostly middle- or upper-middle class people although the presence of some very wealthy people tends to skew this figure upwards.

Curriculum: Although School C considers itself a comprehensive school offering a full range of programs, all of these programs show a more practical than intellectual bias. The principal has been a prime mover in a diversified occupations program not only in his own school but throughout the region. He points out that 35% of the students go directly into the labor market. Those who go onto college (64%) often do so to get further training in the occupational program in which they were engaged in high school--i.e. electronics, food services, etc. Although only one out of every 10 students actually goes into farming after graduation, many more are in farm-related career programs so that agriculture forms an axis around which many of the other occupations move. Many of the students who study agriculture in high school go on to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

study it in college.

The actual course content in the basic subjects such as English and math tends to be more narrowly interpreted than in at least three of the other schools. For example, although three of the other schools are making some attempt to divide their English program into mini-courses centered around a theme or skill, School C maintains the usual English I through IV sequence. The principal feels that even within the English courses there is too much emphasis on literature and not enough on grammar. He believes that the community wants good, solid students who can read and write and spell; and he maintains that literature must wait until this is accomplished. A selection of comments on a questionnaire filled out by former graduates contains four out of 25 complaining about English as a "waste of time" while six out of 25 statements praise math and science courses for their rigor and for providing them with the basic information they needed to achieve well in college.

Student Relationship to the School.-- In School C the career orientation dominates student scheduling. In freshman and sophomore years, the school attempts to group the students as heterogeneously as possible. In junior and senior years, students in certain programs have their classes scheduled together. For example, scheduling of work-study programs tends to result in work-study students also taking subjects such as English and social studies together. The principal believes that the students are not "locked into" a sequence, however.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This separation according to occupational interest has an effect on how success is distributed in the school. The principal states that the successful student is one who "feels good in what he is in." The principal minimizes grades as a criteria for success and emphasizes instead "success in the curriculum the student has chosen." Since there are many separate programs, there are many separate ways to be successful. The unsuccessful student, on the other hand, usually comes to high school as a failure especially in reading and continues this pattern because of "poor motivation" or "lack of goals." The principal clearly places the "blame" for failure on the student or on his previous educational experience. Those students who are successful within the terms of the school are rewarded with a range of rewards from the honor society to recognition at special work-study banquets. This awards system supports the claim that success is not the province of one curriculum but is available as are rewards in all programs.

In much the same way, extra-curricular activities are dispersed throughout the different programs. In addition to the usual sports and clubs offered in all high schools, School C maintains work-related "clubs" as a compulsory activity incorporated within the work-study program. In this way students presumably become inducted into not only the work side of their future occupation but into its social side as well. The idea of work providing not only remuneration but also social status, pleasure, and conviviality permeates this type of thinking. In this way one might assume students learn

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the kind of citizen role in which men are encouraged to join the Rotary Club, the building trades association, the businessmen's groups out of which come many of the community benefits.

There is not physical place in the school in which student can congregate on their own, supporting the idea that there appears to be a lack of legitimacy for total voluntary interaction. Indeed, it would seem that social activities are simply not sought in this school unless legitimated by a clear relation to growing up to participate in the life of the community.

Staff Relationship to the School.--School C's teachers do not participate formally in any decision-making. The teachers serve on committees concerned with certain problems such as curriculum or commencement speakers from which come recommendations to the principal. These recommendations are not final; there is not formal faculty decision-making body with power to mandate its wishes. Some faculty members volunteer to be on these committees while the principal asks other members to serve. Some examples of recommendations of these committees that have been accepted in the past include picking plays and dates, passing on field trips, etc. The faculty also works on curriculum; but it is not clear how much of voice it has because the principal says he has proposed most of the curricular changes adopted in the past three years. The principal sets the time and agenda for faculty meetings. He sets up the teaching schedules although he says he does take suggestions from the teachers. His decisions are then final. Clearly, the decision-making process in this school is centralized in the office of the principal. This is probably accounted for by the position which the principal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

occupies in relation to the community. Even though many of the teachers live in the community and know it very well, at times of decision, the principal's decision is mandatory.

When the principal was asked about working with teachers, he replied that he might be too "democratic" or permissive. with teachers--at least in the view of some of the townspeople. There is a definite feeling on the part of some of these people, as perceived by the principal, that the teachers should conform to the generally accepted traditional view of education. The principal sees conflict between the pedagogical orienation of some of his teachers and this community view. Or to put it another way, he sees conflict between theorientation of the community and the professional functioning of these teachers. He is concerned in fact about some of the English teachers who he believes are not giving the students the basic education they need. He has two openings in this department this year and is trying to find people to fill them who are more in line with his own philosophy and that of the community.

To the principal, the faculty seems heterogeneous in its educational outlook even though it includes many teachers who are graduates from nearby colleges and several former graduates of the high school, including the principal himself. There is some division because of educational philosophy, according to at least one teacher who commented on the "coach mentality" of the school. The principal is a former coach and the present coaching staff would appear to enjoy some added status in the school. One other faculty member reported that the teachers almost struck the school last year and claims that they really shocked the School Board with their cohesiveness and strength.

Socially, the faculty does meet in small, voluntary groups. The principal himself throws a party each year for the faculty and staff. He frowns on the presence of a group of faculty wives from a nearby university who tend to be somewhat "cliquish."

Some of the faculty members here feel that they carry a heavy teaching load. They are required to keep lesson plans in their room, maintain legible grade books, have a written total curriculum for each course, keep attendance records, and have written student goals for each lesson plan. This could be an attempt to minimize the artistic dimension of teaching in favor of the productive, practitioner aspect. The principal is very interested in behavioral objectives for students and feels that if these were used, his job of evaluating teachers would be easier. To sum it up, there is a definite feeling of conflict on many educational issues between a part of the faculty on the one hand and the community and students on the other. The principal is caught in the middle--cognizant of demands on both sides but basically too much of a "teacher man" to really force the teachers to conform and too much a part of the community to want to confront it either. Logically enough, he believes that the central problem in the school is "communication."

The faculty perhaps in response to this pressure and feeling some frustration because the principal will not educate the public does not participate freely in extra-curricular programs unless they are directly involved in them.

The Interest-oriented School

Demography: School I is almost twice as large as School C (enrollment=1540); and although it is only ten miles away from School C, it in many ways is nested in a completely different community. If the agricultural/rural ethos dominates School C, the academic milieu performs the same function for School I. A large state university is located in this community and dominates its educational dialogue. Although many of the teachers in this state university come from the same background as the people in School C's community, their educational aspirations have separated them from their background. The community is a mix of farm, city and these university members.

The presence of the university tends to give the school's clientele considerable interest in modern, progressive schooling. This attitude dominates the public sentiments of the community. Not surprisingly the principal is very aware of "progressive" ideas of administration and attempts to implement them in his school. He feels himself identified with an innovative group of "in" administrators who know how their schools stand in relation to each other. Or as one professor at the local university characterized this school: "If you label School X as an innovator, then this school is an early adoptor." References made by the principal to prominent educational foundations with which he has much contact and to other innovative schools systems indicate that he considers himself more identified with this wider educational community than with his own citizenry. To use Carlson's terms, he is a "cosmopolitan"; and as Carlson demonstrated, much more innovative than the "local" at School C.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Curriculum.--This school, like the others in the study, offers a full range of programs from agriculture, through general, to college prep. This principal considers it a comprehensive school. Its uniqueness lies in the fact that it alone of the five schools has an extensive formal apparatus for the individualization of instruction. It has an independnet study program in which students work on a contract basis on some interest that they define for themselves. It has a program in Audio-Visual Communication in which small groups of students work together and independently on some aspect of audio-visual production, maintenance or use. The school has extensive programs in applied arts which include individualized work-study opportunities. A Vocational Instruction Program attempts to provide basic skills that are tied to work situations for individual students who need to develop specific competencies.

Within the departments there are unique responses to course content. The science curriculum is especially large and a source of pride for the principal. This department offers nine-week courses on such topics as oceanography, parasitology, genetics, ichthyelogy, etc. along with the standard semester courses. The English classes include basic required freshman and sophomore courses and additional nine- and eighteen-week electives based on specific themes or skills. In social studies, students can take tests to exempt themselves from required courses and substitute other work on special topics.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In summary, the thrust of the curriculum as it is structured and as it is delineated in the course descriptions is to meet the needs, capture the imagination, or otherwise respond to the interests of the students within the administratively provided innovative structure.

Student Relationship to the School.--True to its commitment to individualized instruction, School I's sorting of students is quite flexible. There is some tracking but its extent is not clear. Individual differences are taken care of in the programs already provided. The principal would like to see these programs expanded, but he has run into problems specifically with the independent study approach. Only some students stick to it; andsome teachers are more willing than others to participate.

The students who are most successful here are those that the principal calls "typical adolescents"--meaning students with high grades and extensive participation in acitivities. Ths principal seemed somewhat negative about this. He wanted to change over to the stanine grading system which he believes would expand the chances of success; but his suggestion was defeated by the school council. These successful "typical adolescents" get typical awards for their efforts, or so the principal says. Although the handbook lists numerous awards from civic groups, the principal disparagingly mentioned only the National Honors Society, Honor Rolls, and "all that _____." Asked about the typical unsuccessful student, the principal answered quickly and softly "the loner or the drifter."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

From the above statements, one could infer that the principal, who is committed to a program emphasizing self-actualization and the psychological and personal rewards concomitant to this, has run into conflict with the student body which is largely still committed to traditional values at least in the area of school achievement and rewards. The principal seems to believe that the typical adolescent following his own interests and being in the right program will be a success and have a great time. He sees a more open reward system as nurturing fully functioning, growing human beings. Traditional rewards favored by the Council and the student body mitigate against this--or so the principal implies.

The athletic program is also designed to meet the interests of the students. The principal takes great pride in the fact that the interscholastic sports program has three coaches for the girls. About 70% of the student body is involved in an extensive extra-curricular program.

Another indicator of this school's unique response to the adolescent culture is the presence of a Commons which is open at all times to the students. The students are free to collect in the halls, go to the Media Center, or just leave the building when they are not in class. This open campus plan is in sharp contrast to School C's strict supervision of study halls, etc. There are no study halls in School B.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Staff Relationship to the School.--Theoretically an organization that aims to provide the fullest possible participation for its clients should build in a proportionate level of participation for its staff. School B has done just that. This school is the only one having a formal commitment to student and faculty participation in making school policy. The basic decision-making body consists of 20 members--11 department heads, the principal, the media director, the vice-principal, a counselor and five students. All votes are equal and decisions are final. This council decided such things as changes in grade requirements, a "growth" plan for the school, a change in administrative organization and function. There is also a Student/Faculty Senate made up of elected homeroom and faculty representatives. Its role is only advisory to the principal and the council. The principal has sole jurisdiction in personnel decisions--staffing, firing, placement, etc. This is an important exception when one compares this school to other innovative schools where faculty members have full responsibility for hiring people in their departments.

There is some question whether this formal apparatus for participatory decision-making has an effect on the personal or professional relationships of the faculty based on the fact that the principal does not perceive the faculty as cohesive. He says the school has cliques which are rather strongly divided to the detriment of its work in general. The faculty does meet socially but it is not as well knit as the principal wishes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Other demands on the teachers are minimal. They keep attendance records only. In the future, teachers will be required to have 25 students or less as advisees and will work with them for four years.

Extracurricular participation on the part of the teachers appears to be higher than School C's. A study was made by the school of the hours the faculty spent on extracurricular activities per week and the average was 2.5. This included drama and other specialists who are paid. All the rest of the time is voluntary. Another positive response to the climate here is shown in the low turnover rate of 4%.

Internal Structure.--The student handbook is referred to "constantly" in this school; and the students use it as a "legal document," according to the principal. There is also a very complete course catalogue. In this case, it would seem that written records support the democratic values of the school.

A recent editorial of the school paper called for additional protection for students through the adoption of a student "Bill of Rights." It would seem from this that students are concerned about their status and compared to the students in any of the other schools much more eager to legitimate and perpetuate their status.

Discipline infractions are not as extensive as those of School . There appears to be no dress code; but attendance, tardiness, etc. appear to be the standard problems. The principal says drugs are not a problem here.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Community.--As was noted previously, the presence of the University provides School I with a more progressive and cosmopolitan community than School C. The school is used to a large extent on weekends and during the summer. The parents play an extensive role in the school. They are invited orally and/or by mail to come to visit the school. They are consulted a lot on school matters and take advantage of their chance to be heard, or so the principal thinks. In a parent evaluation study done by the school, 97% of the parents rated the school as "above average." The students are involved in the community--tutering, running recyling projects, etc. There are student representatives on the City Council who sit in and voice opinions at all meetings. The fact that students are able to participate in city decisions seems to indicate that participation is valued or at least accepted in the community in which the school is imbedded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Trade School

Demography.--Although School T is located in the inner part of a large city, its relationship to its environment is unique. School T is a cosmopolitan school: that is, it selects its students from the entire city. Admittance is based on reading tests--a grade level of 8.0 for males and 8.5 for females is required. The population the school draws from represents a cross-section of the black community which the principal describes as "very diverse."

Curriculum.--The thrust of this school comes from its organization into nine shops. Each student is assigned to or admitted to one of these shops. It is not clear if they can transfer between shops or if they are locked in from ninth grade on. It is clear though that shopwork takes over completely in junior year and that some shops require a program of prerequisites which would make transferring difficult. Even though "every student is required to be in a shop," the school considers itself comprehensive and offers a full range of programs within this organizational framework. Two-thirds of its students go on to college. No data exist on this but it is assumed that like School C's students, these go on into fields related to their shops. For many of the students admittance to this school releases them from the pressures of their neighborhood high school including gangs and feared lower achievement. The school tailors its curriculum to meet the needs of industries. An Industrial Advisory Council provides input for the programs. Students from the school are placed into jobs before and after graduation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student Relationship to the School.--As has been pointed out above, the students are all organized into shops. In English and math, there is also tracking into essential, regular and honors courses.

The typical successful student in this school is characterized by a pattern of "relatively good grades, few problems in school, parental support, and a measure of aggressiveness." The pattern for the unsuccessful student is the obverse of this: "poor grades, nonconformity, lack of home support." The principal sees success and failure as a style of life rather than as a fulfillment of a few specified criteria, or so it would seem. Unlike the other schools, School I has entrance requirements which tend to select academically successful students.

Rewards for merit are tied to the work orientation also. Besides the usual awards and scholarships, students are rewarded by representing the school at various functions and by placement into programs that allow them to accentuate their own own skills. The best students in each shop have first chance at the best jobs, both while in school and after graduation. The number of jobs varies from shop to shop, but the strategy obviously provides added motivation and incentive.

The school runs a "vast" extra-curricular program including all major sports plus tennis, swimming, bowling, track, GAA. It has an intramural sports program, numerous clubs, etc. Sixty-five percent of the students participate. The overriding interest in high school spectator sports is clear. The principal says that they "bus as many as 1200 students to a football game."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The students spend about one hour a week for clubs to 20 hours a week for football.

Staff Relationship to the School.--In School T. the principal takes his leadership role seriously. He runs the school with the help of the faculty who participate on an informal basis. The principal states that the faculty advises him on curricular decisions, program needs, and matters relating to school structure. Feedback from the faculty comes in two main forms--staff meetings and individual talks. He cited two examples of participation. The English department decided to break up the curriculum into mini-courses. And a student teacher came to him on an individual basis with a suggestion that he decided to use. The teachers seem fairly autonomous although the principal has the final say. Finance and personnel are definitely his areas. He states that he fights hard to get the people he wants and that he makes it so difficult for those he does not want that they usually leave. In the two years he has been principal, he says that no teacher has left the school voluntarily and very few leave each year. He has some problems with the "old guard" who have been there for years and tend to be somewhat resistant to his ideas. The principal states that he is trying to loosen up the staff. He says he wants the students to be more than "mute reactors"; but that several members of the faculty are used to the days when they could ask the students to jump and they would ask "when they could come down."

The principal believes that the school has an excellent, talented staff "that can do everything." Presumably this means that they could work in the private sector as well.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These teachers have a great sense of pride in the school and set high standards for the students. Many of them have been with the school since it was built sixteen years ago and have grown with the school. From all this, it seems clear that the faculty is secure even under this strong leadership, because a large number of them have some very special skills that they are respected for both in and out of this school.

The principal spends about 25% of his time working with the teachers. One might speculate that this is to get his agenda passed. The faculty is very cohesive. Members get together socially in subgroups. Regular in-service meetings every two weeks provide time and structure to presumably build this cohesiveness. The principal terms faculty participation in extracurricular programs as "great." The principal says that all participation is voluntary except that students may pressure a teacher into sponsoring a club.

The teachers seem to have a fair amount of routine duties. They are required to keep attendance, have plan books, supervise halls and lunchrooms, and counsel students. Such duties might go along with the principal's desire to run a tight organization.

Internal Structure.--Schools T, G, and A come from the same metropolitan school system. None of these schools have up-to-date handbooks. School C has a course catalogue that lists courses necessary for each shop. There are no descriptions given of the courses in this catalogue possibly because such descriptions are unnecessary. It seems that students are expected to follow a rather tightly-constructed program to which they have given their initial consent.

The Community.--The community that School T serves is

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

somewhat unique because it is metropolitan in scope. The school, nontheless, is used "constantly" for plays, concerts, talent shows, church activities, meetings of all kinds. The unions use the building for entrance tests. Student participation in the community is "not a big thing"; but they do work in hospitals and tutor others.

The parents have a "very positive image" of the school. They "fight to get their children in" because, as the principal pointed out, "we perform better than other schools. We have a good plant, select good students; and because we draw from all over the city, we break up gangs." The principal emphasized this last point: "Because there are not enough members of any one gang to cause trouble," the parents feel that their children are safer here. Although the principal did not mention this, it might also be possible that the problem of gangs is reduced here because the students are engaged in highly productive work from which they derive a great satisfaction. This, plus their extensive participation in the school athletic program, lessens the possibility of gangs gaining a hold here.

The General School

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Demography.--School G is located in the inner part of a large city. It is the largest school in this study (enrollment=5000+). The school draws from a neighborhood that is composed of a stable section of factory and blue collar workers and a transient section of welfare recipients. As the assistant principal points out, it is difficult to make a general statement for 5200; but it does seem clear that the majority of students come from a low socioeconomic class. One informant said that 70% of the children are on ADC. The school was originally built as a black school and has a sense of pride in its history and in its famous graduates.

Curriculum.--School G in many ways most nearly represents the comprehensive school. A full range of programs are offered from college preparatory to work study; but statements made by the assistant principal seem to indicate that this comprehensiveness does not always serve the best interests of the students. He states that the school is trying to change in the direction of career orientation. School personnel have contacted industries in order to determine the competencies that their graduates must have in order to qualify for jobs. They want to decrease the possibility that graduates will be rejected because they do not qualify. Interestingly enough, the principal says that this shift to a career orientation has a negative connotation in the black community. In addition to the regular range of programs, the school also runs an Outpost program for drop-outs and a Workshop for potential drop-outs. The principal states that this is an

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"academic school with strong emphasis on college preparation." The assistant principal agreed with this while also pointing out that it is a commercial and business school too.

Student Relationship to the School.--Unlike School I, this school, while recognizing its needs for individualization, has limited provisions for it. The Outpost and Workshop programs previously mentioned are about the only programs designed to cope with some of these individual differences. In addition, students are tracked as essential, regular and honors in English and math.

According to the principal, the student who succeeds in this school is involved in his school work and in extracurricular activities and is able to plan for the future. The assistant principal stated that he had "little faith" in such measures as tests. He believes that the successful student has found a teacher who is interested in him personally and cares about his welfare. With this help, he can do things he otherwise could not. Examples were cited of how this has worked in the past. The unsuccessful student, according to the principal, "does not have direction or established goals in life and consequently is not academically successful." The assistant principal stated that the unsuccessful student is "easy to see but difficult to explain." He is usually "one who is not motivated, who fails constantly." The assistant principal then said that he found these questions irrelevant to their situation. "All

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of these questions have nothing to do with the humanity of these children. At impossible odds, against shootings, while caring for younger children, in a life close to survival level, these children are trying to live and learn." Neither the principal or assistant principal gave any answer when asked about the reward system of the school.

The opportunities for voluntary participation in an extracurricular activity seem about the same as in the other schools. There are a few unique activities tied to racial concerns. The participation of 25% according to the principal and of 50% according to the assistant principal is lower than that of the other schools, but the time put in by the typical participant is about the same.

The school is making an attempt to provide students with a lounge of their own but it is having problems with supervision--a problem shared with School I.

The range of disciplinary infractions is considerably wider in this school. The principal says it runs the gamut from unacceptable language to bringing contraband into the school. The assistant principal cited such infractions as gang activities, drug pushing, fighting with teachers, etc.

Staff Relationship with the School.--There seems to be a large measure of faculty participation in the decision-making process of the school. Recently the faculty investigated and voted on the 45-15 plan for the school year. According to the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

principal, "curricular change is the faculty domain." In the previous school year, he said there were "committees effective in working with student rights and responsibilities, maintenance and lunch room problems." He says that he is responsible for "final decisions after inputs." The assistant principal supports this view. He says that the principal has complete charge of administration, personnel, and payroll; the faculty takes care of the curriculum. There are large and small group meetings to get faculty inputs. The assistant principal gave additional examples of faculty decisions; changes in the English curriculum, the unit planning concept, and the career orientation program.

The principal works very little with individual teachers. Some faculty needs are met in faculty meetings which are at times broken up alphabetically into four groups to reduce the problems caused by faculty size. The assistant principal is supposed to work with individual teachers who are having trouble; but when he cited all of his duties it became clear that there would not be much time for this.

The principal believes that the "faculty is cohesive but spread out." There are some subgroups, but they are not seen as opposing. The assistant principal supported this limited degree of faculty engagement. He says there are subgroups based on common interests. He also says that there are some racial subgroups but that he did not want to comment on them except to say that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

he wished they did not exist. The faculty meets socially to some extent. The assistant principal pointed to a measure of mutual support as evidenced by the concern for the principal when he was hospitalized and by the financial help given a teacher who was in trouble. In keeping with this, the principal "affiliated with the teachers rather than with the administration during a recent strike." Daily bulletins keep the faculty informed about school events.

Routine duties for the faculty are about the same as those of other large city schools. Teachers must keep attendance records, have lesson plans and daily units, submit textbook orders, budget,and supply requests. Each teacher has one duty a day either in the lunchroom or in the hall.

Both respondents felt that a large part of the faculty participated freely in voluntary extracurricular activities. Some sponsors are paid. According to the assistant principal, teachers are not asked to take an activity and usually the same people volunteer.

School G has a unique problem in teacher retention because some teachers are made to leave to integrate other high schools. This school's turnover rate of 15% is higher than that of the other schools.

The principal pointed out that he feels that he has a progressive faculty but that many teachers are not "true artists" that can reach students on a "personal basis." On the other hand, he feels that there is a spirit here that can succeed in making this school "what it was in the past academically." He cites the change to the 45-15 plan as indicative of this

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

forward-looking approach. Now he says the teachers must "be creative" in their classes or changes in the overall structure "will not improve the situation." Although everyday living for the students is difficult, the princiapl statesthat only 500 out of 3000 "make it a school problem." He also pointed out that this school received the highest number of scholarships in the city for the last two years.

The Community.--The school and the community seem to have a fairly supportive relationship. School facilities are used extensively on weekends by religious and other organizations. The assistant principal pointed out that it "is the only institution of its size in the community." The school runs a recreational program throughout the year.

Parental involvement seems to depend on the exigencies of the moment. The principal states that while parents are not involved "to a great degree," there is a "reasonably effective community group" which advises on building rehabilitation, extension and remodling, the physical education program, textbook selection, etc. The assistant principal says the "council gets angry when things don't go well," and can be very vocal when it is aroused.

The regard of the parents for the school is dependent on the particular parent. The principal says that "those parents who are knowledgeable about the school think favorably while the less knowledgeable are negative or neutral." The assistant principal supports this view. He says that "some parents love the school." For some, "the school is truly a family affair with all eight children of one family attending. Others run to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

other schools where they run into other problems."

Both respondents agree that student participation in the community is extensive. The students are involved in tutoring, art fairs, social centers, athletic programs.

At the end of the interview, the principal commented that the area the school serves is "reasonably stable in many ways. The community does not react quickly to situations" because it has a fairly pervasive low socioeconomic status. He points out that the "school does have gang problems, high crime rates, a couple of areas in the district that are really bad"; but that on the whole "the values of the people are the [socially] accepted values." He believes that community members need guidance in order to see how they can become involved. He said that it is "not that they are not interested, but that they do not know what to do." He said that "there are a large number of young people in relation to adults"--the ratio is about 3 to 1 in favor of those under 21. He believes that the "adults in the area are not lost; they are effective."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Academic School

Demography.--School A's enrollment of 1446 represents a drop from about seventeen hundred. Because of this the principal feels he cannot offer the range of programs he would like. This drop in enrollment has also resulted in a loss of faculty this year which is quite high when compared to Schools C, I, or T.

The reasons for the drop is that the school is located in a relatively stable community which has many older residents whose children are now grown. Many of the other residents with school-age children are on their way to the suburbs and what they believe will be better schools. The principal for these reasons and others describes the community as "quasi-stable." Over the years the community has been populated by different waves of ethnic groups so that the principal can say that is is a "neighborhood school that is also cosmopolitan." At the present time, the population is about 65% Jewish, with the next major grouping composed generally of Middle European minorities, followed by a small percentage of blacks who come from all over the city under the open enrollment policy.

Curriculum.--The strong intellectual bias of this school differentiates it from the others in the study. When one looks at the percentage of graduates that go on to college, one might conclude that even though this chool's rate is slightly higher, it is not significant. When one looks at the thrust of the curriculum, however, differences emerge. Again this

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

school is as comprehensive as the others; it offers a full range of courses. The principal in this school, however, was the only one out of the five to add to the list of programs ones for Early Involvement (in college) and Advanced Placement. The presence of these programs seems to support the idea that the school has high academic standards. In each academic department, there is provision for a range of courses from remedial through honors to advanced. The course descriptions are thorough and seem to indicate a fairly traditional approach to the disciplines. Technical and business education are offered but not as extensively as they are at Schools C, I, or T In no other school was advanced placement mentioned in the course catalogue.

Student Relationship to the School.--The academic emphasis of this school can be seen in the departmental tracking of students. In English, students are grouped into basic, essential, regular and honors; in science, into lab and non-lab; in history, regular and honors. The selection is based on test data, elementary teachers' records, parent interviews and student selections. The teachers and counselors review placements periodically.

The principal describes a typical successful student as one who has "learned to cope with the situation" whether it be the home situation, his personal or economic situation or the school structure itself. He believes that success is dependent upon the individual and what he wants. The unsuccessful student

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"has failed to learn how to cope with the situation." He is someone who withdraws from the situation, or "tolerates the situation without seeking benefit from the system." The principal feels that the unsuccessful student might tolerate a situation to be a "success" at home, due to parental pressure.

Recognition for merit takes the form of the typical honor societies. The principal pointed out that there were also service awards given by different school service organizations. The extracurricular program reflects somewhat this service theme. In addition to the usual activities, the principal mentioned at least four service organizations. The different ethnic groups also contribute to the diversity of the extra-curricular activities. There are special interest clubs and activities such as Greek dancing and foreign language newspapers. A low percentage (33%) of the students are involved in this extensive program. There are no special facilities for the students in which they can congregate freely. The principal did suggest that students had easy access to faculty offices and many were able to mix freely with the teachers "over a cup of coffee."

Staff Relationship to the School.--The principal believes that the staff does participate in the decision-making processes of the school; or, as he put it, "the structure is there." He gave examples of decisions that the faculty has made. The gym department launched a program of coed gym in an attempt to cut absenteeism. The faculty decided on a pass/fail option for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

juniors and seniors. On another occasion the faculty tried to arrive at a consensus on cuts and tardies but could not because of different philosophies. The principal says that the faculty is involved in "local decisions" but that there are not many of these. In this school system, the principal is "the ultimate decision maker." He points out that the "local council is an advisory group made up of parents, students, teachers, elected by their peers." This group nominated him as principal but cannot fire him because he has tenure. He says that now this council wants to rate teachers.

The Community.--The community does not use the school building extensively presumably because there are other buildings in the vicinity. The social center and the pool are open to the public on weekends. The parents participate through the local council, the Tiger Booster Club, and the P.T.A. although this organization is dying. They are also involved in some tutoring.

The parents show a certain division of feeling about the school. According to the principal, many of them think it is not as good as the ones in the suburbs. Perhaps because of this the parents are very concerned that the standards of the school are kept high. The Council's attempt to rate teachers is an example of this. Compared to the other two schools from the same system, this appears to be the one in which parents are most actively and politically involved. The Council is more than an ad hoc group responding to specific problems. It appears to be an extremely viable and purposive body that knows what it wants the school to be and is willing to fight to attain this end.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Interview Form for Principals

Principals' Name ______________________________ School__________

Respondent's Name and Title_____________________________________

Interviewer____

Directions: Circle the correct response on multiple-answer questions.

1. What is the total enrollment of this school? __________

2. About what percentage of your entire graduating class last year is now enrolled in a regular 2-year or 4-year college?
   - A. 0%
   - B. 1-9%
   - C. 10-19%
   - D. 20-29%
   - E. 30-39%
   - F. 40-49%
   - G. 50-59%
   - H. 60-69%
   - I. 70-79%
   - J. 80-89%
   - K. 90-99%
   - L. 100%

3. About what percentage of your graduating class last year went on to some post-high-school education or training of some kind other than a junior college or 4-year college (for example, beauty school, technical-vocational school, or business school)? Do not include military service or post-graduate high school work.
   - A. 0%
   - B. 1-9%
   - C. 10-19%
   - D. 20-29%
   - E. 30-39%
   - F. 40-49%
   - G. 50-59%
   - H. 60-69%
   - I. 70-79%
   - J. 80-89%
   - K. 90-99%
   - L. 100%

4. How many catalogued volumes are there in your school library?
   - A. None or less than 249
   - B. 250-499
   - C. 500-749
   - D. 750-999
   - E. 1,000-1,499
   - F. 1,500-2,499
   - G. 2,500-4.999
   - H. 5,000-7,499
   - I. 7,500-9.999
   - J. 10,000 or more

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

5. Are space and equipment available for students to do laboratory work in biology?
   A. Yes
   B. Courses are taught without laboratory.
   C. We offer no courses in biology.

6. Are space and equipment available for students to do laboratory work in chemistry?
   A. Yes
   B. Courses are taught without laboratory.
   C. We offer no courses in chemistry.

7. Are space and equipment available for students to do laboratory work in physics?
   A. Yes
   B. Courses are taught without laboratory.
   C. We offer no courses in physics.

8. Which best describes the location of your school?
   A. In a rural area
   B. In a residential suburb
   C. In an industrial suburb
   D. In a small town (5,000 or less)
   E. In a city of 5,000 to 50,000
   F. In a residential area of a larger city (over 50,000)
   B. In the inner part of a larger city (over 50,000)

9. How would you describe the students served by this school?

   ____

10. From these following alternatives, which one do you think best describes the pupils served by this school?
    A. All children of professional and white-collar workers
    B. Mostly children of professional and white-collar workers
    C. Children from a general cross section of the community
    D. Mostly children of factory and other blue-collar workers
    E. All children of factory and blue-collar workers
    F. Children of rural families

11. Which of the following curricula does your school have? (Circle all those offered.)
    A. College preparatory
    B. Commercial
    C. General
    D. Vocational
    E. Agriculture
    F. Industrial Arts
    G. Work Study
    H. Other (Please specify.) ________________________

12. How would you classify this school? (Examples in next question.)

13. From this list of items, which one best describes the classification of this school?
    A. An academic school with strong emphasis on college preparation
    B. A comprehensive school
    C. A special curriculum school that is designed to serve the culturally disadvantaged
    D. Vocational, technical or trade school
    E. Commercial or business school

14. Does this school have a track system or some equivalent means of providing for individual differences?
    A. Yes
    B. No

15. If it does have such a system, would you describe what it is and how it operates?

16. How do you recognize merit in the student body?

17. How would you describe the typical successful student in this school?

18. How would you describe the typical unsuccessful student?

19. Does the faculty participate in making decisions that affect the entire school?
    A. Yes
    B. No

20. If there is provision for faculty participation, can you give an example of how it works?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

21. What are some decisions the faculty has made?

22. What sorts of decisions call for faculty participation?
What sorts of decisions are made by the principal?

23. What sorts of routine demands are made on the faculty?
(i.e. attendance records, plan books)

24. To what extent do you work with individual teachers on classroom problems, i.e. curriculum, objectives?

25. How would you describe faculty relations here?
Cohesive? Subgroups? Examples?

26. Are teachers here likely to get together socially?
A. Yes
B. No

27. Does your school have an extra-curricular program?
A. Yes
B. No

28. What does this program include? List as many different offerings as possible.

29. What percentage of the students participate in this program?

30. For a typical participant, how many hours a week does this extra-curricular program involve? Minimum? Maximum? Range of participation?

31. What is the extent of faculty participation in the extra-curricular program? For example, do they attend school functions freely or are they required to do so?

32. What is the percentage of teachers who leave every year?

33. Would you describe the community served by this school as
    A. transient
    B. stable

34. Would you consider this a
    A. neighborhood school
    B. cosmopolitan school (serving students from a wide range of areas)

35. In what other ways would you describe your school population?

36. Do the children as students participate in activities in the community?
    A. Yes
    B. No

37. If yes, can you cite examples of the types of activities that these include? (tutoring? work study? bands? recycling? surveys? day care?)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

38. To what extent would you say that the school plant is the center for community or other organizational activity?

39. What are some of the uses the community or other groups make of this facility?

40. Do the parents take an adjunct role in the school? Give examples.

41. What do you think the parents think of this school?

42. Does the school have a handbook for teachers or students?
    A. Yes (Ask for copy, if available)
    B. No

43. How important is this handbook?

44. Does the school have a catalogue of courses?
    A. Yes (Ask for copy, if available)
    B. No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

45. Do the students have any special facilities of their own? Give examples.

46. How does the faculty find out about a change in rules or other salient information?

47. Are there any channels for official disciplinary action?
    A. Yes
    B. No

48. What sorts of infractions are put through channels? (Try to get a range of infractions.)

49. Is a summary profile of this school from achievement test data available? If so, could we have a copy or make a copy?

50. Is there anything else you want to tell me that will help me to understand better the distinctive character of this school?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barton, Allen H. *Organizational Measurement*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961.

Coleman, James S., *et. al*. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Georgopoulos, Basil S., and Tannenbaum, Arnold S. "A Study of Organizational Effectiveness," *American Sociological Review* (October, 1957), 534-540.

Hage, Jerald, and Aikan, Michael. *Social Change in Complex Organizations*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Hall, Richard, *et.al*. "Organizational Size, Complexity and Formalization," *American Sociological Review* (December, 1967), 903-912.

Halpin, Andrew W., and Croft, Dan B. "Organizational Climate of Schools," *Administrator's Notebook*, XI (March, 1963), 1-4.

_______________. *The Organizational Climate of Schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1963.

Owens, Robert G. *Organizational Behavior in Schools*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Price, James. *Handbook of Organizational Measures*. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1972.

Rogers, E. M. *Diffusion of Innovations.* New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Tagiuri, Renato, and Litwin, George H. (eds.) *Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Thelen, Herbert A. "The Process, Practice, and Profession of Education," Unpublished manuscript, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1972.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALP Ethos Project
February, 1973
Thelen & Staff

Report ALP # 9

ALP-ETHOS MANUAL

PREPARATION OF THE CLASSROOM VIGNETTE

Introduction

However defined, the "Ethos" of a classroom cannot be directly observed. It is a set of ideas, not an object; it must be inferred from other things that can be observed. The obvious "other thing" is "what goes on" in the classroom; and the obvious people from whom to get observations are the ones who make these things happen (and in whom the Ethos is internalized): the students and teacher. The device used to obtain their perceptions is the ALP-Ethos instrument.

The data are generated by asking each person to arrange the items in order of their fidelity to his perceptions of the class. The starting point for analysis is a display of these judgments in a concise "readable" form-- The Basic Data Display.

How does one go from this display to conclusions about the Ethos of the class? What is the form of such propositions? What intellectual processes are involved in interpreting the data? Does the inquiry follow any describable, systematic, reproducible course?

Granted that human insight-formation cannot be programmed, it is still possible to work up to it systematically and to make clear the points at which science and art part company--and later converge in conclusions. This manual presents the "method" of interpretation that we have worked out. Its basic strategy is to break the complex task of interpretation into a sequence of simpler steps, and to describe the procedure for each step with as much precision as its nature allows.

The product resulting from the operations described in this Manual is a 7 -part report, the standard Classroom Vignette.

This Manual includes the following Sections:

Page
3 A. List of the ALP Items and the Categories they Represent.
4 B. OVERVIEW: The Strategy of Investigation
9 C. Conceptual Orientation: Resume of ALP Theory
14 D. Exemplary CLASSROOM VIGNETTE for Class "X"
26 E. Detailed Procedures for Preparing a Classroom Vignette

APPENDIX B

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A. List of ALP Items and the Categories They Represent

Items	Categories
	AUTHENTICITY
2 I felt really challenged [illegible] others 11 said.	Openness
3 It made me think more [illegible] of my 12 own.	Stimulation, personal cognitive
I felt like talking with the teacher and 13 other classmates after the meeting.	Participation, closure-seeking
11 I felt that during the activity I could 14 be the sort of person I wanted to be.	Life-style congruence
13 I felt the activity clarified some previous 15 personal experiences.	Assimilation to past experience
17 I was excited by what was happening. 21	Affective arousal
23 I felt the time passed quickly for me. 22	Unselfconscious absorption
24 I felt like contributing to the activity. 23	Participation- during meeting
	LEGITIMACY
4 As a group we had good reasons for what we 24 did	Rationale, public
6 Our meetings at times really exemplified 25 good group process.	Model for activity
7 We concentrated our activity on the 31 significant aspects of the task.	Significance
12 We understood the nature of our task and 32 tried to see what it would require us to do.	Logical Requirements
14 Some of the things we found out will be 33 useful in other situations.	Future utility
18 The procedures we used in working together 34 [illegible] in other groups as well.	Generalization, dependability
21 Our [illegible] 35 help guide our behavior.	Purpose and commitment as guides
The issues that [illegible] up in our group 41 are also [illegible] in the larger society.	Context, imbeddedness
	PRODUCTIVITY
1 We decided what we wanted to do and we did 42 it.	Decisiveness
3 We accomplished a great deal. 43	Accomplishment
5 We knew how well we were progressing in our 44 task.	Knowledge of Progress
One thing flowed from another.	Continuity, Sequence
We ran into problems and solved them. 51	Problem-solving
The diversity of our individual backgrounds 52 aided the group.	Resource Utilization
We all helped each other. 53	Cooperation
20 We each contributed our special skills 54 to make the final product.	Role Coordination

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B. OVERVIEW: The Strategy of Investigation.

The "simpler steps" into which the "complex task of interpretation" has been divided can be regarded as distinct lines of inquiry. Each line is coherent, limited, and has its own distinctive contribution to make to the overall investigation.

1. A, L, and P "scores".

Eight of the items are "keyed" to Authenticity, 8 to LEgitimacy, and 8 to Productivity. The median rank of the 8 items for each concept may be regarded as a sort of quantitative "score" for the extent to which the concept describes the class. Thus a classroom might be reported as low in A, high in L, and moderate in P. These medians are reported on the sheet labelled ALP Dimensions: Analysis.

These scores are extremely rough indices and about all they can do is summarize the quick impression one gains by inspecting the Basic Data Display. These scores are singularly inadequate for comparing classrooms. Two classrooms having the same relationships among the three scores might very well differ markedly in their actual operation. The three ALP concepts are simply too abstract, too far from the details of operation, to enable their scores to give more than the haziest impression of "what was going on".

2. Internal relations within A, L, and P

Therefore one would want to consider the internal relations among the 8 items keyed for each concept. Instead of asking "How much of A, L, and P is present?", this investigation asks "What is the pattern and quality of A, L, and P as three different aspects of the same total operation?"

3. The Effects of "Context"

In the course of diagnosing the themes that organize the A, L, and P items, one finds that other items support or raise questions. Thus, for example, the same pattern of A items suggests a different quality of authenticity if other non-A items such as P1, L12, and- L16 are high or low. Thus although the A items crudely index the amount of A (Step 1) and also tell us something about the character or quality of A (step 2), the further fact is that other non-A items modify these interpretations. We re-discover our original theoretical proposition, that A,L, and P are not to be regarded simply as independent variables each of which accounts for some "part" of the culture; they are instead to be regarded as distinguishable but inter-related emphases or aspects characteristic of the whole culture. Every statement (ALP item) is keyed to one concept but it contains or implies components of all three qualities.

Hence the wording of ALP Dimensions: Display and of ALP Themes: Discussion sums up the themes of step 2 as modified by the systematic perusal of all three sorts of items in each cluster in relations to each other. Thus the interpretation of each conceptual aspect, A, L, and P, begins with the 8 items keyed to it but ends with consideration of all 24 items. The aim is to describe the same cultural pattern from three points of view rather than to describe three separate portions of one total pattern.

It should be noted that the description of three aspects of the same "whole" is quite"theoretical". In order to find relationships and themes we must bring to bear on the data a considerable body

of prior understandings. To the person unfmailiar with ALP ideas, these interpretations may seem far-fetched, magical, or projective. For example, he may be baffled by the seeming inconsistency involved in giving the "accomplishment" of P1 one meaning when A17 (excitement)is high and L12 (task requirements) is low and a quite different meaning when the ranks of A17 and L12 are reversed. Nevertheless, such"inconsistency " could be deduced from the ALP theory, the correlations would confirm it (or at least not refute it), and the patterning of the other items would support it. But, in spite of all this, interpretations of themes are still in the realm of "meaning" and there is no way around the fact that "meanings" depend on one's conceptual frame of reference.

4. The Communicative Description.

For the ALP findings to have practical utility for teachers, methodologists, etc. we have to go one step further. We must present a descriptive account in everyday language; we must present a report that can stand on its own feet regardless of "theory". From the standpoint of this step, the preceding analyses are simply inquiries to help us "internalize" what the class is really like---and any reasonably comprehensive thoroughly-understood theory (ALP or not) would serve this purpose.

The final step, then, is as act of communication, of explaining in everyday language what we have found out. We return to the basic data and to the question that elicited them: How well does each item describe your class? We tell the reader how the class answered this question and we try to show how the facts form a pattern than can be summarized in familiar language. The reader is not burdened with our theories; he is asked to decide merely whether what we have put into words does indeed --for him--"catch" the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"flavor" (or Ethos) of the operation. The "meaning" to the reader, then, is not to be sought in our conceptual frame of reference but rather in his own experience with the phenomena we describe.

This "communicative" report is given in the Description of the Class; and it is summarized in the Characterization of the Class.

5. The Use of Information from the Teacher.

The "theoretical" and "communicative" sections should be meaningful to one who understands our theories or to one who has participated in the class. But what about other readers? What can they use in place of ALP theory or participant knowledge? It seems to us that these persons would be greatly helped--even as we have been-- by knowing something of the demographic character of the class and something about the activities in which it was engaged--e.g. lecture, small group projects, recitation, etc. We have asked the teachers to supply this information for further pruposes of research, but we are including it in the Classroom Vignette (the section entitled Information from the Teacher) as an aid to the general reader.

6. Comparisons with Other Vignettes

The profile of means for one class can be correlated with profiles from other classes that have already been studied. One might find that a new class in English correlates positively with a formal math class, negatively with a discussion-type social studies class, and insignificantly with other English classes. On re=reading the Vignettes of these other classes, one would ask himslef what sort of pattern could account simulataneously for these various relation-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ships. He might even identify certain "pivotal" items that would help focus his intjal probing of the data.

In any event, knowledge of classes that are similar to and different from an unknown class does help one "place" the new class within the multiplicity of "types". Until we have accumulated many more classes and studied their "types" more systemeatically it would seem most appropriate to include this comparative information (when it is informative) in an informal comment or two at the end of the summary Characterization of the Class.

7. Other Investigations

Finally, the Classroom Vignette, the subject of this manual, barely scratches the surface of possible investigations. We believe it provides a sort of"baseline understanding" on the strength of which a great many more focussed --and simpler -- questions can be raised and investigated. How do the perceptions of the teacher differ from those of the students? Boys versus girls? High versus low achievers? Classes in French versus classes in Math? Classes in affluent suburbs versus classes in poor urban schools?

Each such simpler investigation throws more light on what the class is like because it enables additional bodies of knowledge to be brought to bear on the data -- ideas about sex differences, achievement "needs", socio -economic status, etc. In some cases, the ALP data have led us to explore such further questions; in other cases, not. We have decided to include a brief account of such further "optional" inquiries within the Classroom Vignette. The section is entitled Additional Analyses and Explorations. As these and other explorations lead into full-fledged systematic studies, futher manuals and ALP reports will be produced.

C. CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION: Resumé of ALP Theory

In terms of the group's way of life, authenticity is concerned with its qualities as a psychological and interpersonal milieu. Legitimacy is concerned with the varieties of authority which are resorted to in order to justify and correct the group's discourse. (Thus legitimating authorities govern the socializing functions of the class with respect to knowledge, morals, etc.) Productivity applies to that part of group life which coordinates the efforts of individuals in order to achieve common purposes to which the group is committed.

In more detail, here are some of the notions that may help focus the inquiries required to produce the Classroom Vignette.

Authenticity. One way to approach this notion is by seeing what it excludes. A situation cannot be authentic if it feels artifical, contrived, trumped up; if its ostensible purposes are sensed to be different from the purposes it "really" serves; if one doesn't know what to make of it or even how to go about finding out what to make of it; in short, if one's past experience in life so far cannot be brought to bear on the situation. On the other hand, an authentic situation does not necessarily have to be comfortable, [illegible], or familiar--"real" life has its stresses and frustrations, too. And, to confuse the matter further, one learns ways, authentic to himself) -for coping with artificial or trumped up situations.

Hence authenticity is not definable entirely in terms of the ituation; one must consider the quality of the person's life in that ituation. For classroom use, at least, the quality that indicates

authenticity is "full-functioning"; one has thoughts, feelings, moods, fantasies, etc, he can "learn" from his experience; and he can, if he is so disposed, examine it to find out about himself, others, the nature of ideas, the world, etc. He is "involved" in the sense of grasping opportunities rather than defending himself, he admits others as partners and enricheners, not as threats or constrainers. He is able to respond in many ways, and he feels "free" to make his own choice and to accept the consequences thereof. But the acid test is penetration of experience to the "inner core" -to the "self", to the "deepest" levels of "meaning".*

Legitimacy. Unlike authenticity which may exist at any level from "superficial" to "deep", some pattern of authority referees every situation. The question is not "How legitimate is the activity?" but rather " In what terms or on the basis of what authority is the activity legitimated?". Legitimating authorities can include personal desires, teacher demand, task requirements, group goals, rational imperatives, cultural assumptions about values, etc. Concern for legitimacy--and for learning "legitimate" behavior--motivates the processes of socialization. And because all activity is shaped by its underlying authority , all educational processes,

---

* Classroom activities are seldom intended to penetrate to these "deep" levels. There are usually trade-offs: some dimensions of authenticity are subdued in order to maintain productivity; and some of the possible legitimating authorities are muted in order to enhance authenticity. etc. We hope to learn from these classroom studies what qualities of A,L, P tend to combine into various coherent patterns or "types" of classroom ethos.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

whatever else they may include, are most fundamentally processes of socialization. The educational consequences of classroom socialization for personal fulfillment and for societal effectiveness depend on the modification of the pattern by the further processes associated with authenticity and productivity.

Most classroom discussions of what is in the text book--"subject-matter" oriented recitations, for example,- tend to be legislative discussions. What is being legislated is what one is supposed to think, say, and remember about various topics. To the extent that such discussions are authentic, they have "personal" (and private) "meanings; to the extent that the ideas are applied in transactions with phenomena, especially with some purpose in mind, the meetings have a component of productivity.

In relation to aspects of group life, the legitimating authority is basically an idea. It may be as implicit an idea as a "basic assumption" transmitted in the culture -- a value for example-- that people do not know they hold. It may also be as explicit as specifications of a special kind of statement required by the logic of an argument. It may be a group norm created from pooled expectations or it may be a consciously, even arduously, legislated agreement on goals, methods, procedures, or recommendations. I think the legitimating ideas are the ideas the group lives by, and that when they become explicit it is usually in the context of processes of authority and decision making. When explicit, these processes probably range, in the classroom, from direct orders given by the Teacher to "democratic" discussion and arrival at sense of the meeting. At these times, the group is operating neither as a psychegroup (in which considerations of authenticity are dominant) nor as a goal-oriented production team (when considerations of productivity are dominant). The group is operating as a legislative assembly, and the roles of the participants are basically those of citizens or members rather than friends or producers

We rather expect that different bases of legitimacy will correspond with different processes--and therefore outcomes--of learning. An activity legitimated by middle-class mores ("This is the way nice people behave") suggest processes of shaping through external rewards and punishments, whereas an activity legitimated by a shared commitment in the group to achieve some goal desired by all would seem to invite mature reasoning, judgment, and decision-making. Thus the nature of legitimacy may imply: the kinds of demands to be responded to; the characteristics of the learning process; and the species of generalization that will be generated in the learner from his experience in the activity.

Productivity

In its general meaning, productivity can be attributed to individual students, to the average of a collection of students, and to the classroom as a social-psychological entity or group. This third attribution is the one we are concerned with because ethos is a characteristic of the group; it is not a trait of singular persons. Productivity is a salient characteristic of a group when it is functioning as a group and the concept of a "productive group" is entirely analagous to the concept of a "productive society" (as distinguished from a community or interpersonal milieu).

HEnce the eight items keyed to productivity detail the distinctive features of a productive group. It is guided by shared purposes and commitments; it develops and utilizes individual resources; it has knowledge of its own progress; it coordinates special skills of members, etc.

The classroom that would most nearly satisfy the criteria implied by the 8 items would probably be project' and/or "action-oriented". It would be directed to making things, changing environmental conditions, and solving problems. It would act purposively and should consciously obtain feedback, assess the situation, and make decisions about next steps. It would not only produce, it would learn or develop a methodology of production. These learnings would increase its"power to produce " [which is the literal definition of "productivity"]; and there would be responsive changes or modifications of group expectations, standards, role performance, and aspirations. And the full participation of the student in these processes would at the same time develop his personal "effectiveness"-- a major aim of education.

All classrooms have some component of productivity . Some P items may be ranked high and others low. The size and nature of this component depends on the trade-offs among concerns for authenticity (e.g. student-centeredness), legitimacy (e.g. socialization of discourse and way of life) and productivity (e.g functional adaptation and personal effectiveness) The optimum blend of these components depends of what part of the overall educational mission the class is responsible for. The task of the ALP interpreter is to discern the blend that exists; and the task of the ALP theorist is to reflect on these descriptions and try to develop both criteria for optimum blends and policies for their development in the classroom.

D. Exemplary Classroom Vignette for Class "X"

International ALP-Ethos Study
University of Chicago
H.A. Thelen

CLASSROOM VIGNETTE

portraying:

Classroom "X"

CONTENTS:

1. Characterization of the Class
    Brief Precis of the Findings
    Other Classes strongly correlated with this one
    (This Summary is abstracted from:)
2. Description of the Class
    Progression of Items and themes from most to least characteristic or descriptive.
    (This account refers to:)
3. Basic Data Display
    Tabulation of ranked data used in this Vignette
    (These data are also analyzed for:)
4. ALP Themes: Discussion
    The nature of authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity inferred from ALP-Theoretical analysis.
    (This account is expanded from:)
5. ALP Dimensional Display
    Schematic analysis of A, L, and P dimensions along the continuum from most to least characteristic.
6. Additional Analyses and Explorations (Optional)
    E.G. boys vs. girls, high vs low achievers, comparisons with other classes, etc.
7. Information from the Teacher
    Demographic "control" variables
    Activities Profile
    Other

Analyst: Thelen, Vonke, David

Date: February 1973

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[illegible] 15

Code: ______________

Cols. ______________

N: ____ B ____ G ____ T ____

Class: X

Subject: ______________

School: ______________

Teacher: ______________

1. Characterization of the Class

This class perceived itself in this one day's activity as a forum for individuals to exchange opinions and interests. It is characterized as an interactive, supportive milieu, and the activity has the quality of good, lively, stimulating conversation .

The class clearly perceives itself not as an action-oriented group, deciding on projects and then coordinating the skills of its members to achieve explicit shared goals.

In between and neither especially characteristic nor uncharacteristic, are rankings of various kinds of cognitive "content" related to the larger society, to specific tasks, and to previous private experience.

The profile of this class correlates highest with the other two classes from the same school in Budapest; and then with two seminars for graduate students in Education at the University of Chicago. Both these seminars (Thelen & Stodolsky) attempt to get students to "think through" and assimilate for themselves social-psychological principles. The class correlates negatively with a graduate seminar set up to study its own processes and personalities, with an inservice workshop for inner-city teachers, and with a strongly teacher-structured French class in the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago.

[illegible] 16 Class: X

2. Description of the Class

Top-rated is the feeling that one wants "to contribute to the activity" (A24), and that this involvement carries over into conversations outside the class (A9). Students are stimulated to have "new thoughts of their own" (A8). The class tends to "be excited by what was happening" (A17); and "time passes quickly" (A23). Many students feel "challenged by what others say"(A[illegible]).

Less dominant but clearly supportive are three items from the next group: "I felt that during the activity I could be the sort of person I wanted to be" (A11), "We decided what we wanted to do and then did it" (P1); and "I felt the activity clarified some precious personal experiences"(A13). The autonomous self is less prominent than the lively interactive participant.

The five most cognitive items also appear in this moderately characteristic range. Except for the first, "Some of the things we found out will be useful in other situations" (L14), the others tend to represent increasing constraints on the personal "freedom" of the dominant theme:" As a group we had good reasons for what we did"(L4);"The problems we had of working together appear regularly in other groups as well"(L16), "The issues that troubled us in our group are also prevalent in the larger society"(L22); "We understood the nature of our task and tried to see what it would require us to do" (L12); and "We concentrated our activity on the significant aspects of the task" (L7). One notes a progression (toward uncharacteristic) from general personal utility of ideas, through increasingly impersonal generalizations, to demands dictated by tasks--with the latter verging on rejection.

Finally, there are the last 8 items, separated by a large gap (2 S.D. of the mean) from the other 16. These are almost certainly uncharacteristic, they describe what the group is not. Taken together, what is rejected is the perception of the group as united in the pursuit of explicit purposes (L21); conscious of its efforts to be a "good" (probably efficient) group (L6), capitalizing on diversity of individual resources-- "backgrounds" (P18) and "special skills" (P23), helping each other (P19), facing and solving problems as a group (P15), keeping track of progress toward common goals (P5), and "accomplishing" a great deal (P3).

3. Basic Data Display   Class, [illegible]   [illegible]-18

Mean Diff. Group A L P

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Most	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]*				[illegible]				
	2	[illegible]	[illegible]	—	[illegible]				[illegible]				
	3	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]				[illegible]				
	4	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]*				[illegible]				
	5	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]				
	6	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]				[illegible]				
	7	[illegible]	.36	V		[illegible]*			6				
	8	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]				[illegible]				
	9	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]		[illegible]				
Descriptiveness	10	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]							
	11	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]				[illegible]				
	12	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]*			[illegible]				
	13	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]			[illegible]				
	14	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]				
	15	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]		[illegible]				
	16	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]				
	17	[illegible]	[illegible]	VII			[illegible]		22				
	18	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]*			[illegible]				
	19	[illegible]	[illegible]	VIII			[illegible]		23				
	20	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]		24				
	21	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]				
	22	[illegible]	.51				P5		[illegible]				
	23	[illegible]	[illegible]	IX			[illegible]		[illegible]				
Least	24	[illegible]					[illegible]		[illegible]				

Col. 1 Computed Means
Col. 2 Differences
Col. 3 Groupings of items
Col. 4-6. The A, L & P items
* Best agreed upon
() Least agreed upon

Col. 7 ____________

Col. 8 [illegible]
Col. 9 ____________
Col. 10 ____________
Col. 11 ____________
Col. 12 ____________

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Class: x

4. ALP Themes: Discussion

Authenticity

The top six, most characteristic items are all keyed to authenticity: personal meaningfulness: motivation, interpersonal challenge, new ideas, etc.

The remaining two A items are ranked 8th and 11th, and are more related to the private self: could be the sort of person I wanted to be, clarified previous personal experience.

This dominant theme of authenticity is supported by items ranked 7th, 9th, 10th, and 12th: ideas will be useful to me, I made decisions, had reasons, saw connections.

Legitimacy

The most prominent justification or legitimizing idea is that one learns useful things, has "reasons" for activity, and sees connections to other activites. Lesser bases of legitimation are that the activity throws light on significant issues and/or that it is in response to defined demands of tasks. Uncharacteristic, possibly rejected bases of legitimacy are awareness of the criteria of a "good group" and guidance by the authority of shared group purposes.

Productivity

Seven of the eight items keyed to productivity are perceived as relatively non-salient or even rejected. The one somewhat characteristic item appears somewhat more related to the sense of personal autonomy than to group productivity: we influenced the activity. In increasing order of uncharacteristicness are that one thing flowed from another, that individual diversity of "background" aided the meeting, and that people "helped" each other. The three most uncharacteristic items of the 24 are all keyed to productivity:

we knew how well we were progressing, we accomplished a great deal, and we faced and solved our problems.

Note: The "layering" of A, L, and P is striking, perhaps it is due to the fact that the ratings are of a single classroom activity rather than of a large amount of activity over a long period of time. In any case, we note that all 8 "authenticity" items are among the top 11 most characteristic, that six of the eight "legitimacy" items are among the middle 9, and that 7 of the eight "productivity" items are included in the ten least characteristic.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Class: ____________

5. ALP Dimensions: Display

	AUTHENTICITY	LEGITIMACY	PRODUCTIVITY
Illustrative Dimensions to Consider:	Group as Personal Milieu: Interest Interaction Absorption Own Thoughts Excitement Self Experience etc.	Group as Socializing Agent, under "authority" of: Own reasons Ideology Values Task Demands Utility Social Generaliz. Societal Issues Common Knowledge etc	Group as Productive Team: Decision-making "Accomplishment" Task Progress Continuity, Activity Problem-solving Cooperation Resource Utilization Individuality Special Skills etc
	ANALYSIS	OF THIS	CLASS
Rank of 8 Items — Median	4.5	3.5	19.5
Rank of 8 Items — Range	[illegible]	[illegible] 21	8–24
Dominant Aspects or Dimensions	① Individual interest ② [illegible]	① [illegible] ② [illegible]	① in terms of personal satisfaction
Subordinate Aspects or Dimensions	③ [illegible] ④ [illegible]	③ Persuasion and [illegible] (?) ④ Task demands and [illegible]	① Individual [illegible] and [illegible] ④ "Excellence" of [illegible]
Absent, Irrelevant or Suppressed Aspects		⑤ Ideology of group [illegible] [illegible]	⑤ [illegible]

Manual -- 26 Class: X

6. Additional Analyses and Explorations

a. Comparison of Class and Teacher Perceptions

On the 24 items, the class and teacher agree within 3 ranks on 10 and within 9 ranks on another 13. They disagree wildly--by 21 ranks-- on the remaining item, "We accomplished a great deal" (P3). It appears that the class and teacher defined "accomplishment" very differently.

As for the major differences, the teacher sees the class as working on and solving problems (as distinguished from working through task-exercises; generalizing their experience to other situations, participating more in decisions; and being clearer on the reasons for "what we did". The interactive interpersonal quality that dominates the perceptions of the class is perceived by the teacher at the 11th rank and lower.

The items agreed upon (within 3 ranks) are practically all of the "cognitive" manifest items--the "content" as distinguished from the personal "meanings" of the discussion.

One may speculate that the class was able to be so individually "free" and spontaneously interactive because the teacher was following a logic of inquiry--even though the class apparently was not very conscious of it.

b. The Correlations

The correlations contribute to the confidence of some of the statements above, especially the notion that the middle items portray constraints on the sense of personal freedom.

The most striking additional finding is the central

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

position of A24, "I felt like contributing to the activity". A24 has significant correlations, both positive and negative, with 13 other items. A24 and its correlates constitute virtually the entire content of Principal Factor #1 which represents 19.6% of the total variance.

All but two of the other 7 top-rated items correlate significantly positively with A24. Possibly the proper label for the dominant theme should be "personal interest in participating". The other 8 of A24's correlations are distributed over the remaining 16 items and, with one understandable exception ("The diversity of our individual backgrounds aided the group") are negative ; they are associated with feelings of not wanting to contribute

This is the first protocol we have encountered in which one item so centrally organizes the perceptions of the class; and, as aforementioned, in which the authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity items are separated with so little overlapping into layers.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE CLASS

To the Teacher: I am deeply grateful to you for administering the ALP-Ethos instrument to your class. I shall send you our interpretation of the data and will be happy to receive your comments on their accuracy.

In this study we shall have data from comparable classes in seven countries and the results will be available to you from the researcher who asked you to participate in this study.

In order to interpret the data more intelligently and also to facilitate comparisons across countries, I would appreciate your giving me the following information about this class.

Herbert A Thelen, University of Chicago

1. Teacher's name____________________

2. Name of School____________________

3. Address of School____________________

4. Subject or Name of Course ___Formmaster's lesson___

5. Basis of selection of students into this class (track, stream, other

~~learning more mathematics and physics~~

6. Age of Students ___16___ "Grade" or Level ___[illegible]___

7. Number of students taking the ALP instrument ___25___

8. Number of Boys ___16___; Number of Girls ___9___

9. After graduation, how many students plan on: college ___14___; TEchnical or commercial school ___6___; a Job ___5___; travel, "work experience", or other interruption of schooling________

10. Can you give some estimate of the "ability" of this class? E.G., its median or average I.Q.?_______; or scores on placement tests? _______; or its position among all classes of the same age cohort, such as top 10%, middle, bottom third ___one of the best at school___

11. Impression of socio-economic status of students. E.G. typical occupation of father, income level ___In a good economic status, half of children of working classes___

12. Did teacher also "take" the ALP instrument? If so, how can we identify his response sheet? ___his name on it___

(It would be good to have the teacher's perceptions as a check on the students' perceptions of the class)

(Not used with Case "K", will be used from now on)

CLASSROOM ACTIVITY LIST

Percent of Time in Class Spent in Various Activities	Activities	Check if Applicable in Your Classroom
______ 1.	1. Teacher Presentation	
______ 2.	2. Class Work	
	a. Student reports, presentations, plays, etc.	a. ______
	b. Going over assignments	b. ______
	c. Planning Activities with class	c. ______
	d. Exchanging ideas	d. ______
	e. Watching films, demonstrations, TV.	e. ______
______ 3.	3. Small Group Work	
	a. Team projects	a. ______
	b. Conversation, experience swapping	b. ______
	c. Tutoring or helping	c. ______
	d. Games, simulation	d. ______
	e. Working on problems	e. ______
______ 4.	4. Individual Seatwork	
	a. Working on assigned exercises	a. ______
	b. Reading, studying	b. ______
	c. Conducting experiments or investigations	c. ______
	d. At other facilities: e.g. library, learning center, etc.	d. ______
______ 5.	5. Testing	
______ 6.	6. Teacher-Pupil Conferences	
______ 7.	7. Other	
	a. ______	a. ______
	b. ______	b. ______
	c. ______	c. ______
	d. ______	d. ______

TEACHER NAME __________

CLASS __________

THIS ACTIVITY LIST APPLIES TO: (check one)

______ a "typical" week

______ a specific class period.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

E. Detailed Procedures for Preparing a Classroom Vignette

STEP 1: BASIC DATA DISPLAY

The basic data are the means and standard deviations for all the items. These are part of the computer print-out.

The data are to be entered on the standard form entitled Basic Data Display--- section 3 of the Vignette.

Preparation of this display involves:

a. Entering the means and item numbers in sequence from smallest to largest means.

b. Dividing the items into clusters.

c. Indicating one of three levels of confidence for each item.

d. (Later). Entering any other ranked data useful in the discussion of Additional Analyses.

The procedures are as follows:

a. Entering the means and item numbers.

This involves filling in columns 1,2,4,5,& 6. These columns display:

Col. 1. The means of the items, in sequence from smallest to largest.

Col. 2. The differences between pairs of adjacent means. These figures are written between the lines.

Cols. 4 - 6. The code numbers of the items corresponding to each mean in Col. 2. The A items are listed in Col. 4; L items in Col. 5; and P items in Col. 6.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

b. Dividing the Items into Clusters.

It will be noted in Col. 1 that the sequence of means does not proceed regularly with equal intervals between items. There are likely to be 2 to 5 "large" gaps which tend to divide the sequence of 24 items into 3 to 6 shorter sequences or "clusters." Clusters are designated by Roman numerals in Col. 3.

The conventions for dividing the sequence into clusters are:

1) All gaps or differences larger than 1.0 are taken to be breaks between clusters. A solid black line is drawn across the page at each such break.

2) If a cluster contains more than four items, one looks for gaps smaller than 1.0 but larger than the others-- e.g. a gap of .69 surrounded by gaps less than .30. Dashed lines are drawn across the page for these more tentative divisions.

c. Indicating the Level of Confidence

The amount of agreement on the items is shown by their standard deviations. The item in whose ranking we have most confidence is the one best agreed upon. It is useful to recognize three levels of confidence or agreement.

The procedures for indicating level of confidence are:

1) Arrange the standard deviations in order from smallest to largest.

2) Examine the sequence and look for 2 gaps that will divide the sequence into three segments. Hopefully two such gaps will be found in the ranges of ranks 3 - 9 and 16-21, respectively.

3) In columns 4,5,& 6 indicate the confidence level of each item by asterisking items in the top segment (most confident) and enclosing in parentheses the code numbers of items in the bottom segment (least confident).

STEP 2: THE WORK SHEET ANALYSIS

The thinking called for may be characterized as a dialogue between data and concepts. The basic data display has just been completed. The concepts are presented in Section C, above, Conceptual Orientation: Resume of ALP Theory.

The Work Sheet assists the dialogue to proceed systematically. The work sheet is not included in the final report but it is filed with the other research notes on the class. The work sheet prepared in connection with the Vignette on Classroom "X" is presented on the next page.

The purpose of the Work Sheet is to aid the analyst to get a complete view of the data and to enable him to jot down tentative speculations, themes, and questions as they occur to him. The notes on the Work Sheet anticipate all the rest of the Vignette. The procedures for preparing the Work Sheet are designed to help the analyst get the data in mind, gradually sense the pattern, and make a preliminary diagnosis of the ALP dimensions.

a. Getting acquainted with the data.

Place the left edge of the Work Sheet next to column 6 of the Basic Data Display. Copy or paraphrase the wording of each item. (Listed in Section A). Pay attention to the sequence and try to guess what item will come next. Then read the whole list and ruminate.

b. Reflection on Activities

Read the Information from the Teacher, note the activities typically engaged in, and see what sort of "sense" the sequence of items makes in view of this information.

c. Orientation: the "type" of class

Examine the correlations of this class with other classes

Class "Y"

[illegible] Preliminary Analyses

Statements	Analysis		
	Authenticity	Legitimacy	Productivity
Feel [illegible] contribution	gratifying	Expected in Role	motivated
Get new ideas, feel [illegible] chatting with others Excited Challenged by others time passes quickly Learn useful things (Be goal set) (we decide and do) we have reasons Clarify personal experience Our problems typical Face larger Issues Understand, meet Task Requirements [illegible] Focus on significant [illegible]	[illegible] want to test [illegible] with others Sense of [illegible] [illegible] Feel adequate [illegible] Achievement Understand [illegible] [illegible] Sense of "[illegible]" [illegible]	"School" objectives ideas & skills Internal "Logic" of Activity [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]	Individuals involved in [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
Used as Individuals Accomplish, good process	[illegible]	Ideology [illegible]	[illegible] individual [illegible]
Contribute Special Skills Help each Other Have Strong group purpose Knowledge of resources Accomplish a great deal Run into Problems, solve them	[illegible] [illegible] support [illegible]	Direction Shared [illegible] or goal commitment [illegible] Requirement or demand sequence [illegible]	coordinated effort Share [illegible] activity seen as means to [illegible] goals goals [illegible]

and form a beginning impression of this class's overall orientation.

d. The Basic Continuum.

Consider the first several items in the top cluster or two and state your general impression of the dominant perceptions of the class. Then look at the bottom clusters to see what is excluded from the top and to get a sense of the continuum from most to least characteristic.

e. Cluster themes.

Considering the items in each cluster separately, try to characterize the nature of the cluster's authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity. Seek for a principle that "knits together" the A.L, and P items within the cluster and excludes the A,L, and P items not in the cluster. Write the A,L, and P aspects and the cluster "theme" in the appropriate spaces.

f. Contextual Items.

It is worth keeping in mind that the meaning of each item depends both on its own statement and on the other items in the same cluster. Thus the authenticity item A2, when accompanied by L12, suggests competitiveness which may or may not be "authentic" to a person's way of life; but when accompanied by P19, A2 suggests that "challenge by others" may stimulate a quality of inner dialogue which is almost certainly "authentic". Thus the theme of a cluster cannot be obtained by "adding together" the item statements, one must look behind these statements to the underlying quality that embraces them all. (The articulation of such new qualities constitute genuine conceptual discoveries.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. The "Scale" of Descriptiveness

The interpreter usually finds himself under some tension as he attempts to diagnose the ALP dimensions and cluster themes. The tension is between the content and the rating of the cluster. To fully grasp the content he must disregard the rating. The difficulty is greatest with clusters that are rated fairly "low".

Consider, for example, a cluster composed of P1, P3, and P5. If this cluster were rated high, it would suggest a "democratic" purposive group that was highly conscious of relationships between its activities (means) and its goals (ends). But when the cluster is rated low, one is tempted to say something like " Well, the top cluster seems to be oriented to individual activity and interests and P1, P3, and P5 all begin with _We_ (did such and such). Since the group cannot at the same time be following individual interests and also common purposes, the cluster must obviously be rated low". In this case, one looks at the lower cluster only from the standpoint of whatever dimensions seem central to the _top_ cluster; and one tends to ignore or possibly not sufficiently consider the other dimensions--in this case achievement, progress, and group decision-making-- about which the top cluster is silent. One acts as if the top cluster represented the whole pattern and the other items are used primarily to make this hypothesis more plausible. This approach is useful but it is also inadequate because important possible contributions of the lower items are missed. A second objection is that this line of reasoning tends to collapse the scale of ranks to "true-not true", and the finer distinctions made by the students are not fully utilized.

Accordingly, then, the following procedure is suggested:

1) Describe each cluster fully, as if it were true and also independent of the other clusters.

2) Compare the top and bottom clusters with each other and ask "Could they both be true?", "What dimensions of the two are reconcilable and which aspects are incompatible?" Note that these latter characteristics may define the ends of a continuum from most to least characteristic.

It is quite possible that the top and bottom clusters cannot be immediately sensed as containing "opposite" or "contradictory" elements. For example, the top cluster might accentuate the theme of "feeling like participating" whilst the theme of the bottom cluster is " we formulated and solved problems". One must then ask himself "Under what conditions would these perceptions mutually exclude each other?" That is, what theory would account for the large difference in descriptiveness of the two clusters? At this point, it is time to consider the "in-between" clusters.

3) The second cluster is compared with the first. One would expect the two to have common elements because their items are contiguous. Yet something about the second cluster made it less vivid or attractive than the top cluster. One asks "Why was this second cluster downgraded from the top?" This alien, irrelevant, or unattractive element would, one would suppose,be even more heavily represented in the third cluster than in the second, so one would attend to it next.

Similarly, one would work up from the bottom cluster toward the middle.

The middle cluster is usually sufficiently far removed from top and bottom clusters to represent some third, quite different theme. Continuing with the instance sketched under 2), this third theme might be "cognitively-oriented exercises with subject-matter". Putting it together, one would see that the top cluster characterized how the students felt about the activity; the bottom cluster described actions that did not occur; and the middle cluster described the activity that actually occured.*

By the time the interpreter has found this much coherence in the whole pattern, he is "ready" to move on to the next steps.

STEP 3. ALP DIMENSIONS: DISPLAY (Section 5 of the Case Vignette)

This is a concise summary of the progression of ALP qualities from most to least characteristic. It is recorded in the form "ALP Dimensions: Display," and the concepts listed at the top of this form may help one be concise. About all that can be added here is a reminder of what the summary is supposed to accomplish: first, the "boiling down" of the ALP content analysis and second, the locating of changes along the scale of descriptiveness of the ALP qualities.

STEP 4. ALP THEMES: DISCUSSION (Section 4 of the Case Vignette)

The just-completed summary is now taken as the outline

---

*This illustrative pattern may not be generally found. For the time being we shall regard the progression "Characterization-description-incompatible action" as only one of several possibilities, and we are much interested in discovering others.

for three paragraphs which briefly discuss the sequences of themes for authenticity, legitimacy, and productivity. The example in the Case Vignette will probably clarify sufficiently what is involved.

STEP 5. DESCRIPTION OF THE CLASS (Section 2 of the Case Vignette)

Steps three and four have been invitations to ALP theorizing. In the present step, we return to the simple level of descriptiveness. Our aim is to communicate to other persons who may not be familiar with ALP concepts.

The Description of the Class is a statement of the items in the order of their ranks plus short connective or thematic sentences to call attention, in the simplest possible way, to the changes in the pattern as one goes down the ranks.

The items themselves are quoted or paraphrased accurately; and the statements are accompanied by item numbers in parentheses so the reader can refer to the exact location of the item on the Basic Data Display sheet.

The connective and theme sentences call for great precision. Many of these assertions can be at least partially checked by selected correlations among items. (In the case of Class "A" the correlations greatly increase our confidence in our statements) We have not insisted upon a prior systematic analysis of correlations because their quantity and usefulness varies greatly among classes. In many cases, especially when the actual rather than the ideal class is being described, the correlations are too few, too low, or too seemingly inconsistent to be interpretable at the relatively simple level of thematic description.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The sample description in the Case Vignette illustrates our expectations of the manual.

STEP 6: CHARACTERIZATION OF THE CLASS (Section 1 of the Vignette)

The overview characterization is a concise summary of about 100 words.

It contains three paragraphs. These reflect the instructions given to the students: to sort the items into three piles. Pile #1 contains the items that "more or less fit your impression of the class"; Pile # 3 contains the items that "don't apply at all and may even contradict your impression"; Pile #2 contains the left-over items that "are hard to decide about".

Hence our first paragraph states the dominant theme or aspect as perceived by the students. The second paragraph states the theme of the "don't fit" items. The third paragraph states the theme of the "in between" items.

In addition, if the correlations of this class's profile of means with other classes looks interesting, we may comment on the nature of the positively and negatively correlated classes. Each class we "work up" becomes a sort of reference "model" to help me] succeeding classes.

STEP 7: ADDITIONAL ANALYSES AND EXPLORATIONS (Optional)

The ALP and descriptive summaries present our conclusions about the class. These conclusions may be regarded as hypotheses that can be partially tested through further analyses of the data. Such further analyses would approach the same data from different, so far unused, perspectives: teaching, sex-cultures, achievement "needs", etc. Thus the teacher can be compared with the class, boys with girls, high achievers with low achievers (if we have data on achievement). Our explorations with such additional analyses show that they enrich the Vignette description, turn up fascinating new relationships, and are simple and easy to accomplish.

In Step 7, then, we include such optional analyses as may have been done up to the time of writing the Vignette, we indicate central findings, and we make the more obvious connections to points already made in the Vignette. Section 6 of the Vignette for Class "X" shows what is involved.

STEP 8: COMPLETING THE CLASSROOM VIGNETTE

a. Assemble the various forms and sections in the order shown by the exemplary case Vignette of Class "X".

b. Have the report edited by another staff member, make whatever improvements make sense, and put unresolved issues on the agenda for the next staff meeting.

c. File the worksheet in the folder for the class.

d. Be sure that all print-outs for the class are returned intact to the proper data book.

d. Arrange for final typing of the Vignette.

e. Xerox a copy for yourself and 4 copies for the files. (Further duplication for distribution to colleagues will be arranged by the staff).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS: AFTER SORTING SLIPS:

Here are three rows of boxes. The boxes are placed in order from #1 to #24--Just like your row of slips

Box 1 represents your #1 slip -- "most descriptive"
Box 2 represents your #2 slip -- "next most descriptive"
Box 24 is for your "least descriptive" slip.

STEP 1 Reading down your row of slips copy the 2-digit number from each slip into the box that represents it.

STEP 2 In the five spaces below each digit select and blacken the space that has the same number as the digit below.

LIKE THIS:

	14	← This box is for the 14th slip in the row.
STEP ① →	3 5	← Write the 2 digits here
	1 1	
	2 2	On the 14th slip, the 2 digit number happens to be 35.
STEP ②	▮ 3	← Blacken space 3 for 1st digit, 3.
	4 4	
	5 ▮	← Blacken space 5 for 2nd digit 5.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
① →								
②	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2
	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3
	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4
	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
① →								
②	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2
	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3
	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4
	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5

	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
① →								
②	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1	1 1
	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2	2 2
	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3	3 3
	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4	4 4
	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5	5 5

STEP 3 Please select and blacken the correct space(s) in the boxes below:

My name is ______________________ Date ______________

These ratings are of: an Actual class [A], an Ideal class [I]. I am: Male [M] Female [F]

My age to the nearest half year is: [11 ½ 12 ½ 13 ½ 14 ½ 15 ½ 16 ½ 17 ½ 18 ½ 19]

The letter assigned to this class is: [A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z]

The 2 large letters on my item envelope are: A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Instructions

The accompanying envelope contains 24 statements on 24 slips of paper. You are to arrange these statements in such a way that they describe either some actual class you belong to or your idea of what an ideal class would be like. (The teacher will tell you which you are to describe).

Procedure

Step 1. Sort the items quickly into three piles. In one pile, place the "most descriptive" items that more or less fit your impression of the class. In the next pile, place the "doubtful" items that are hard to decide about. In the third pile, place the "non-descriptive" items that don't apply at all and may even contradict your impression.

Step 2. Pick up each pile in turn and arrange its items in order of their descriptiveness.

Step 3. Form the sequences from the three piles into one sequence of 24 items, with the "most descriptive" items first, then the "doubtful", and finally the "least or non-descriptive" items. You should end up with all 24 slips laid out on your desk and arranged in order of how well they describe the actual or ideal class you were asked to describe.

Step 4. Record the sequence of items on the other side of this sheet. Please follow instructions carefully, and use a number 2 pencil only. Avoid stray marks and, if you erase, erase cleanly.

Step 5. Please fill in the additional information requested in the lower part of the response sheet, sign your name, and fill in the date.

Thank you very much.

Do not write below this line

1	2
3	4
5	6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATEMENT ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

The socioeconomic status index used in this study is the one devised by Otis Dudley Duncan which appears as an appendix in the book on Occupations and Social Status by Albert J. Riess, Jr., (New York: The Free Press, 1961).

This index used the occupations listed in the detailed classification of the 1950 Census of Population along with the occupational characteristics section of this census. The SES ranking was computed from two variables: education (the percentage in each occupation that are high school and/or college graduates) and income (percentage reporting $3,500 or more income). These two percentages were then adjusted for age and a multiple regression equation was computed to get the index. Duncan suggest that a good way to use this scale is to convert it to a ten-point ranking.

In this study each of the occupations given by the students for their fathers (and for their mothers where fathers were deceased) in the official office records of the school was listed. Using the SES Index described above, these occupations were given a number from 1 to 100. In cases where the place of employment rather than the occupation was given, attempts were made, based on an overall knowledge of the socioeconomic standing of the high school, to arrive at a ranking. Where this was too questionnable, no coding was done.

The occupations given in Sycamore, Sullivan and DeKalb were more easily adaptable to the Index. In these cases, one person did the coding which was verified by a random check of 10% of the sample by four other members of the staff. The margin of error of the original coder was less than 10%. In Dusable and Dunbar, because of the fact that students listed places of employment rather than occupations, another staff member recoded the entire school. The second coder took the highest possible placement for a particular category of place of employment and the lowest possible and then struck an average between the two. The ranking of the second two coders--one for each of the schools--was then rechecked by the original coder. There was 90% agreement between the coding of the two second coders and the original coder. The remaining 10% was discussed and a compromise was struck.

The Socioeconomic Index numbers were then transposed to a ten-point scale, as suggested by Duncan, and this number was used to indicate the socioeconomic status of the subject.

In Dunbar and Dusable, students whose parents were on welfare were allowed to omit father's occupation from their official records. It is not known how many of the students in these schools for which we have no information are in reality on welfare. The principal at Dunbar reported that 95% of these "no-information" students were probably on some sort of assistance. Because of the scarcity of information on SES at these two schools, students were also placed into four categories: 1=Aid, 2=Employed, 3=Unemployed and 4=No information.

Susan G. Ausman